



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1999

No. 141

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 18, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 659. An act to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2990. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts; to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2990) "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts; to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 548. An act to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miami National Historical Site in the State of Ohio.

S. 762. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week H.R. 2260, the so-called Pain Relief Promotion Act will be brought to the floor of this chamber. The bill's supporters say passage will result in more humane treatment of terminally-ill patients. Tragically, they are mistaken.

This bill's passage will do two things. It will overturn Oregon's death with dignity law, and it will undermine the rights of States to establish medical standards. It also puts law enforcement agencies in the position of second-guessing one of the most difficult medical decisions faced by doctors: how to best alleviate the pain terminally-ill patients suffer, whether or not that treatment involves life-ending decision-making.

Congress is frequently put in a position of judging whether to intervene in the States' decisions. Some judgments are relatively easy to make. For example, we now have reached the point where most people are comfortable with the Federal Government protecting against racial discrimination. Such was not always the case. Many decisions, however, are very much in a

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H10121

gray area, which some choose, unfortunately, to use for political reasons. One such gray area, the issues that affect the end-of-life decisions, is not only difficult but personal.

In my State of Oregon we have struggled, debated, and agonized with this issue throughout the last decades. The end-of-life issue is a very complex one. With the advent of new medical technologies, it is becoming even more challenging. There are a wide range of moral and medical issues associated with end-of-life decisions, but none that require Federal interference. Yet Congress is being asked to pass legislation that would undermine a law passed and subsequently upheld not once but twice by a vote of the citizens of Oregon.

Now, our death with dignity legislation is still a work in progress, but the preliminary evidence suggests that this option may actually reduce the incidence of suicide. Rather than having a flood of people to our State to take advantage of the provisions of the law, it appears that individuals having the knowledge that they, their families, and their doctor can control this situation, gives them a sense of peace and contentment that enables many to move forward, enduring the pain and the difficulty without resorting to taking their own life. It may actually reduce the incidence of suicide.

As Americans struggle with these issues, mostly hidden from public view, it is important that we not have the personal tragedy, that agony, that frustration made more difficult by laws that ignore the range of legitimate medical choices.

There are some very serious technical problems with this legislation. It would interfere with the practice of medicine, of pharmacy, of pain management in ways that can have a profound effect on the rights that many in America take for granted. This is why a large number of medical professionals have come forward in opposition to this legislation.

This bill asks law enforcement agencies, not doctors, law enforcement agencies, to make, on a case-by-case basis, judgment as to whether a doctor intended a terminally-ill patient's death while trying to alleviate pain. Asking nonmedical personnel to determine a doctor's intent and subsequent causal connection is neither appropriate nor is it even practical. The threat of these investigations can have a chilling effect open the treatment of pain.

Now, at the same time, some medical boards can and have imposed sanctions on doctors, including in Oregon, for not treating pain aggressively enough. So here we have put physicians in an impossible situation: On one hand non-medical activities second-guessing them and being sanctioned; on the other hand for not being aggressive enough.

Today, doctors help deal with end-of-life decisions everywhere in America;

and, in some cases, I guaranty that every day in America there are the equivalent of physician-assisted suicides. In every State but Oregon people look the other way. Oregon stands out because we have at least attempted to provide a framework. If this misguided legislation were to be passed, ironically, Oregon, the only State with guidelines where we are trying to deal with it, would be subjected to extraordinary scrutiny. Elsewhere, people would continue to look the other way.

I strongly urge the defeat of this ironically termed Pain Relief Promotion Act before it undermines not only the will of the people of Oregon, but also before it damages the sanctity of the doctor-patient decision-making process and erodes quality end-of-life medical treatment.

#### REPUBLICANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED A LOT BUT STILL NEED PRESIDENT'S HELP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton in his press conference attacked the Republican Senators for their courageous stance against a poorly designed nuclear test ban treaty, a test ban treaty that was unverifiable. A lot of the nations had not signed it yet, and a lot of rogue nations never intend to comply with it. But, more importantly, during that press conference he posed a question, "What will happen if the Republicans stay in office?" I am here on the floor this morning, and I feel compelled to answer his question.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the President of some of the past accomplishments of the Republican Party here in Congress, which unlike the ill-advised test ban treaty are actually good for America. If we can be judged by our past, a lot of good things for America will occur in the future if we stay in power. Let me just take a few moments to talk about what we have accomplished.

One of the first orders of business when we took over here in Congress was to declare that Congress would comply with all the laws and statutes which all Americans also have to comply with. We reduced the bloated size of committee staff here in Congress by one-third and added to that a ban on gifts from special interests here in Congress.

We reformed the bloated inefficient welfare system, which held captive many Americans who only wanted a better life for themselves and their families. We provided welfare-to-work incentives for both individuals and businesses. And the Republican-led Congress has succeeded in dropping the welfare rolls to the lowest level in history.

The majority here passed health insurance portability, guaranteeing

working Americans that if they switched jobs or if they lost their job they could continue with their current health coverage.

We reformed the Food and Drug Administration, giving people quicker access to life-saving drugs and medical devices and provided for better food quality.

The Republican controlled Congress got tough on criminals by enhancing penalties for sexual crimes against children, and established a Nationwide tracking system for sexual predators. We also enhanced punishment for drug-induced rape.

Education was enhanced by giving local districts more say in how the money that they had was spent on teaching their children.

We also provided tax relief and allowed for health insurance deductions for small businesses.

We developed medical savings accounts so Americans can better decide how to provide for their health care. We also protected elderly patients from being evicted from nursing homes.

The Republican majority strengthened our national defense by increasing pay and retirement benefits, long overdue for our military; enhancing health care for veterans; and providing for a military which this administration has grossly underfunded and, I believe, forsaken.

Let us not forget the budget. The Republicans passed the Balanced Budget Act and bound our appropriations bills to spending caps. Now, this is the first time in 30 years that this was done. The Congressional Budget Office last week released its monthly budget review and the Federal Government's on-budget accounts, which excludes Social Security, are running a \$1 billion surplus for the year. Again, Mr. Speaker this, is the first time in 30 years. The majority party in Congress are to be commended.

Now, this is probably not new to the average American family, who also has to balance their budget and make their payments without going into deficits every year.

It is interesting that when President Clinton pushed the largest tax increase in history and passed that on to the American public, incidently he got it passed here very narrowly, that same year he could not balance the budget when the Democrats were in control in Congress. The Republican majority passed a lockbox measure, which declared \$1.8 trillion of the Social Security surplus untouchable. But what is amazing is that the President refused to join with us in this budget process to protect this lockbox. He is proposing brand new spending at the same time we are trying to balance the budget and protect Social Security.

Now, the Democrats, when they were in control, when they were in control, spent \$837 billion of the Social Security money for new spending programs. Now

they claim they want to save it. I remind my colleagues we have to remember when the Democrats were in control they spent all the Social Security surplus. In fact, the last year they controlled Congress they spent over \$130 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund.

We are trying to do a great deal around here. We need the help of the President. We have stood for much needed legislation on welfare reform, better health care, better education, tougher criminal penalties, tax relief, a stronger defense, a balanced budget, and, lastly, Social Security protection for our seniors. So I believe, contrary to what the President said in the press conference, the Republicans have done an excellent job for Americans in trying to save this republic and bring accountability. I need to remind the President that great things will occur for the American people if Republicans stay in office.

And in the future, I think we can look for great things for all America, but I remind the President that we need his help too.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O of all the virtues that we desire, we pray, O gracious God, for a grateful heart for the gifts of life and the opportunities of each day. For a nation where we can live in liberty and freedom, for colleagues and friends who encourage us, for mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers who love us and forgive us, for the blessings of faith and the gifts of hope, we offer this prayer of gratitude and thanksgiving. In Your name, O God, we humbly pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 15, 1999.  
Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 15, 1999 at 11:10 a.m.

That the Senate Agreed to conference report H.R. 2684; that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3036.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, Jr.,  
Clerk of the House.

#### ORVILLE MAJORS DESERVES DEATH

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, Orville Majors was convicted for killing patients in an Indiana hospital. Majors is now also accused of killing another 130 patients in hospitals. And after all this, Majors got life in prison.

Think about it. Majors will get three square meals a day, television, free health care, activity in exercise rooms. Beam me up, Madam Speaker. Orville Majors should not be given life; Orville Majors should be given death. It is no wonder America continues to have 17,000 murders a year. The truth is, America tolerates murderers like Orville Majors.

I yield back the unheard screams of 136 American victims.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any rollcall votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3081

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3081.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### PATRIOT ACT

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 659) to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pennsylvania Battlefields Protection Act of 1999".

#### TITLE I—PAOLI AND BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELDS

##### SEC. 101. PAOLI BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION.

(a) PAOLI BATTLEFIELD.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to provide funds to the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the acquisition of the area known as the "Paoli Battlefield", located in the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Paoli Battlefield" numbered 80,000 and dated April 1999 (referred to in this title as the "Paoli Battlefield"). The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the management by the borough of the Paoli Battlefield. The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the borough of Malvern to assure the preservation and interpretation of the Paoli Battlefield's resources.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,250,000 to carry out this section. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of one dollar of

Federal funds for each dollar of funds contributed by non-Federal sources. Any funds provided by the Secretary shall be subject to an agreement that provides for the protection of the Paoli Battlefield's resources.

**SEC. 102. BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION.**

(a) **BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth, or the Brandywine Conservancy, for the acquisition, protection, and preservation of land in an area generally known as the Meetinghouse Road Corridor, located in Chester County, Pennsylvania, as depicted on a map entitled "Brandywine Battlefield—Meetinghouse Road Corridor", numbered 80,000 and dated April 1999 (referred to in this title as the "Brandywine Battlefield"). The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) **WILLING SELLERS OR DONORS.**—Lands and interests in land may be acquired pursuant to this section only with the consent of the owner thereof.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the same entity that is provided funds under subsection (a) for the management by the entity of the Brandywine Battlefield. The Secretary may also provide technical assistance to the entity to assure the preservation and interpretation of the Brandywine Battlefield's resources.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 to carry out this section. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of one dollar of Federal funds for each dollar of funds contributed by non-Federal sources. Any funds provided by the Secretary shall be subject to an agreement that provides for the protection of the battlefield's resources.

**TITLE II—VALLEY FORGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK**

**SEC. 201. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this title is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society (hereinafter referred to as the "Society"), to construct and operate a museum within the boundary of Valley Forge National Historical Park in cooperation with the Secretary.

**SEC. 202. VALLEY FORGE MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AUTHORIZATION.**

(a) **AGREEMENT AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Interior, in administering the Valley Forge National Historical Park, is authorized to enter into an agreement under appropriate terms and conditions with the Society to facilitate the planning, construction, and operation of the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution on Federal land within the boundary of Valley Forge National Historical Park.

(b) **CONTENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT.**—An agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall—

(1) authorize the Society to develop and operate the museum pursuant to plans developed by the Secretary and to provide at the museum appropriate and necessary programs and services to visitors to Valley Forge National Historical Park related to the story of Valley Forge and the American Revolution;

(2) only be carried out in a manner consistent with the General Management Plan and other plans for the preservation and interpretation of the resources and values of Valley Forge National Historical Park;

(3) authorize the Secretary to undertake at the museum activities related to the management of Valley Forge National Historical Park, including, but not limited to, provision of appropriate visitor information and interpretive facilities and programs related to Valley Forge National Historical Park;

(4) authorize the Society, acting as a private nonprofit organization, to engage in activities appropriate for operation of the museum that may include, but are not limited to, charging appropriate fees, conducting events, and selling merchandise, tickets, and food to visitors to the museum;

(5) provide that the Society's revenues from the museum's facilities and services shall be used to offset the expenses of the museum's operation; and

(6) authorize the Society to occupy the museum so constructed for the term specified in the Agreement and subject to the following terms and conditions:

(A) The conveyance by the Society to the United States of all right, title, and interest in the museum to be constructed at Valley Forge National Historical Park.

(B) The Society's right to occupy and use the museum shall be for the exhibition, preservation, and interpretation of artifacts associated with the Valley Forge story and the American Revolution, to enhance the visitor experience of Valley Forge National Historical Park, and to conduct appropriately related activities of the society consistent with its mission and with the purposes for which the Valley Forge National Historical Park was established. Such right shall not be transferred or conveyed without the express consent of the Secretary.

(C) Any other terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be necessary.

**SEC. 203. PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION.**

Nothing in this title authorizes the Secretary or the Society to take any actions in derogation of the preservation and protection of the values and resources of Valley Forge National Historical Park. An agreement entered into under section 202 shall be construed and implemented in light of the high public value and integrity of the Valley Forge National Historical Park and the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 659, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). H.R. 659 is a very important bill. It is necessary to protect two significant battlefields of the Revolutionary War and begin the process of developing a much needed new visitors' center at Valley Forge National Historical Park. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) deserves credit for developing this bill, which protects some of our most treasured Revolutionary War sites.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 659 authorizes appropriations for the protection of the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania. Appropriations for these battlefields must be matched dollar for dollar by non-Federal sources.

This bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society to construct and operate a museum within the boundaries of the Valley Forge National Historical Park. After the museum has been built, all rights, title and interests would be conveyed to the Federal Government;

however, the society would continue to operate the facility.

Madam Speaker, this bill was passed earlier by the House and sent to the Senate where they amended the bill to eliminate a provision that directed the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of both the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields. We have agreement on this item now, on this amendment; and we now have a bill with full bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 659 is a comprehensive measure which provides assistance for the preservation of two Revolutionary War battlefields in Pennsylvania. In addition, the bill authorizes a public-private partnership agreement for the construction of a museum on Federal land within the Valley Forge National Historic Park.

The legislation originally passed the House on June 22, 1999. The Senate considered the measure on October 14 and returned a bill with several minor changes.

Title I of H.R. 659 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide up to \$1.25 million to assist in the protection and preservation of the area known as the Paoli Battlefield. It also authorizes up to \$3 million to assist in the protection and preservation of the area known as the Meeting House Corridor, part of the Brandywine Battlefield.

In both instances the funds provided are for land acquisition only, and all funds provided by the Secretary are to be matched dollar for dollar by non-Federal sources. The Secretary is also authorized to provide technical assistance and to enter into cooperative agreements to provide for ownership and management of the battlefields by the non-Federal partners.

Madam Speaker, Title II of H.R. 659 deals with the Valley Forge National Historic Park, which is so ably represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL). The bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into an agreement under appropriate terms and conditions with the Valley Forge Historical Society, construct the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution on park property. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) has been a strong supporter of this provision and for that he is to be commended.

The Senate amendments to H.R. 659 changed the title of the legislation and deleted the provisions for a special resource study of the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields. These changes do not alter the primary purpose of the legislation. As such, we have no objections to H.R. 659, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the author of the legislation.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this final act to support this legislation, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOOLITTLE), my good friend; and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his support. I also thank the chairman of the full committee and subcommittee, and the ranking members.

Madam Speaker, 222 years ago last month the cry, "Remember Paoli," sounded through the ranks of the patriots who at that time were fighting in the Philadelphia campaign to protect the beginnings of this Nation. It was an unbelievable battle that occurred at Paoli that resulted in that cry. I remember Paoli because 53 young Americans had been butchered by the British. They were butchered by the British with their bayonets because the British did not want to fire their guns to send the signal that they were on the attack. Fifty-three brave young Americans ended up lying on the ground at Paoli where they are at this day buried because they were fighting for the independence of this great Nation.

Madam Speaker, 222 years later, we remember Paoli. We remember Paoli by this legislation, setting aside the 40 acres of that great battle; that battle where America lost, where young Americans were massacred. But the rallying cry became the call for the patriots at Valley Forge, and before that at Brandywine to go on to defeat the British and to allow this Nation to achieve its independence. This, in fact, was one of the most historic campaigns in the Revolutionary War; and today we take action, the final action before this bill goes to the President for his signature to preserve the 40-acre site which is about to be developed.

In fact, it is interesting, Madam Speaker. The deadline for development of this site was the end of October, so we are just a few short weeks away from being able to say that we have saved this site from having been developed. Secretary Babbitt was up at the site not long ago. He lent his personal support, and support from Democrats and Republicans in both this body and the other body have allowed us to move this legislation forward.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), who has been a tireless champion of the Brandywine site which is in his district and the Paoli site which abuts his district and in my district, and the Valley Forge site which is in my district but abuts the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL), who is not with us today, all were instrumental in moving this forward. Senator SANTORUM did a remarkable effort in the Senate, and

we thank everyone who played a major role in getting us here today.

I thank all of my colleagues. At this time I would ask to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a fourth grader signifying the over 4,000 letters and correspondence and phone calls we received from young children asking us to save this site, and I further include the chronology of our battle to save the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields.

FEBRUARY 5, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELDON: I wrote this letter because we need to save Paoli Battlefield. We can't develop Paoli Battlefield because we would love to share the battlefield with generations. We can't stop honoring the fallen soldiers. If we do will lose another battle.

Thank you for helping us save Paoli Battlefield. We know how important Paoli Battlefield is, and it is very nice of you to be a part of remembering Paoli.

Sincerely,

EMILY MURRAY.

CONGRESSMAN CURT WELDON'S CHRONOLOGY OF BATTLE TO PRESERVE PAOLI AND BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELDS

April 95: Malvern Preparatory School challenges the local community to raise the \$2.5 million necessary to save the 40-acre Paoli Battlefield site.

October 95: A non-profit organization headed by Pat McGuigan, borough manager of Malvern, is formed—The Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund.

September 96: Fundraising begins.

October 97: Chester County pledges \$250,000 in matching funds to save the battlefield.

March 98: The Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund approaches Congressman Curt Weldon to ask for his help.

April 28, 1998: Congressman Weldon introduces H.R. 3746 which would authorize \$2,500,000 and add the Paoli Battlefield site to the Valley Forge National Historical Park.

July 3, 1998: NBC's Today Show Features Paoli Battlefield.

July 31, 1998: Congressman Weldon seeks help from Senator Arlen Specter. Senator Specter introduces companion legislation, S. 2401, in the Senate.

August 6, 1998: The House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee passes H.R. 3746.

September 15, 1998: Weldon's language is included in H.R. 4570, the House Omnibus Parks and Public Lands bill.

September 23, 1998: During consideration of S. 2401 by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, S. 2401 is stripped and language is added to authorize only a study of the battlefield.

October 5, 1998: The Clinton/Gore Administration issues a veto threat for H.R. 4570, citing the addition of the Paoli Battlefield to the Valley Forge National Historical Park as a provision of H.R. 4570 which would "cause grave harm to the Nation's resources."

October 7, 1998: H.R. 4570 fails in the House by a vote of 123-302 due to environmental objections.

October 9, 1998: Despite the disastrous Committee amendment, Senator Specter is able to pass the original legislation to save the Paoli Battlefield on the Senate floor. Due to political gamesmanship and controversy, legislation is not brought up in the House.

October 21, 1998: Legislative business of the 105th Congress concludes.

January 6, 1999: The 106th Congress convenes.

February 8, 1999: Congressman Weldon visits the Exton Elementary School to applaud the school's efforts to raise "Pennies for Paoli". During this visit, the Congressman announces his intention to reintroduce legislation to save the Paoli Battlefield. This legislation is known as the PATRIOT Act—Preserve America's Treasures of the Revolution for Independence for Our Tomorrow. The PATRIOT Act also includes provisions to save portions of the Brandywine Battlefield, and to authorize a new museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park.

February 9, 1999: Congressman Weldon introduces H.R. 659, the PATRIOT Act.

March 10, 1999: Senator Arlen Specter introduces companion legislation in the Senate, S. 581.

March 11, 1999: Hearings are held by the House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee on the PATRIOT Act. Fifty Chester County Grade School students travel to Washington, DC to express their support for saving the lands. Congressmen Weldon, Pitts, and Hoeffel, along with Senator Specter, participate in the hearings. General George Washington (a.k.a. Jim Gallagher of Newtown Square, PA) also testifies about the need to save this sacred land.

March 18, 1999: The PATRIOT Act clears the House Subcommittee.

April 22, 1999: Hearings are held by the Senate Subcommittee.

April 28, 1999: The PATRIOT Act clears the House Resources Committee.

May 1999: The PATRIOT Act is ready for consideration on the House Floor, but Representative George Miller, engaged in another act of political gamesmanship, refuses to allow any public lands legislation sponsored by a Republican to reach the House floor.

May 26, 1999: Governor Ridge and the State of Pennsylvania pledge \$500,000 from the Department of Community and Economic Development.

June 8, 1999: Congressman Weldon approaches House Leadership to request their assistance in scheduling a vote for the PATRIOT Act. House Majority Leader Dick Armey, Rules Committee Chairman David Dreier and House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young, and House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee Chairman Jim Hansen all agree to help.

June 16, 1999: The PATRIOT Act is cleared by the House Rules Committee to be considered on the House Floor.

June 22, 1999: The PATRIOT Act passes the House of Representatives by a vote of 418-4.

June 29, 1999: Congressman Weldon announces that funding for Paoli Battlefield is included in the House Interior Appropriations bill.

July 1999: Senator Craig Thomas (R-WY), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands, holds up the progress of the Senate Legislation.

July 14, 1999: The House Interior Appropriations Bill, containing \$1.25 million in matching funds for the Battlefield purchase, passes the House of Representatives.

July 29, 1999: Congressmen Weldon and Pitts meet with Senator Thomas and learn that he was misinformed about the intent of the PATRIOT Act. They clear up the misunderstandings, and Senator Thomas agrees to move the bill to the floor.

August 1999: Senator Frank Murkowski (R-AK), Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, places a hold on all public lands bills in order to force an agreement on a controversial Alaskan lands bill.

August 27, 1999: Secretary Bruce Babbitt visits Paoli Battlefield and pledges the support of the Administration to save the endangered land.

September 1999: Representatives Weldon, Pitts and Hoeffel, and Senators Santorum and Specter work aggressively to convince Senator Murkowski of the time sensitivity and importance of passing the PATRIOT Act. Senator Murkowski finally relents and puts together a package of four lands bills which will be moved in the Senate. Senator Jeff Bingaman, ranking Member of Murkowski's Committee, wants more proposals offered by Senate Democrats included in the package and refuses the package offered by Senator Murkowski.

October 1999: Senator Santorum continues to work aggressively to convince Senator Bingaman of the need to move the PATRIOT Act. Senator Bingaman finally agrees to the package, but Senate Minority Leadership will not agree to the package proposed by Senator Murkowski. Even support from Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt does not convince them.

October 14, 1999: Senator Santorum finally achieves a breakthrough. The legislation is agreed to on the Senate floor by Unanimous Consent, but with a slight amendment. The legislation is returned to the House for final consideration.

October 31, 1999: The final deadline for the Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund set by Malvern Preparatory School looms.

Madam Speaker, as the distinguished chairman outlined, this bill sets aside matching funds for Paoli which have almost entirely been raised. It sets aside similar funds for Brandywine. We are in the midst of raising that money now with the help of the Brandywine Conservancy, and it allows the Park Service to develop a new plan and a contract to develop a new visitors' center at Valley Forge National Park.

There are many people I would like to thank, Madam Speaker, too many to mention by name. I will include a listing of those individuals at this point in the RECORD.

#### THANK YOUS!

Senator Rick Santorum and Staff: Jill Hershey, Mike Hershey, and Zack Moore.

Senator Frank Murkowski, Senator Jeff Bingaman, Senator Craig Thomas, and Jim O'Toole, staffer on Thomas' subcommittee.

Specter staff: Pam Muha (no longer with Specter, but was the driving force over there), and Kevin Mathis.

Chairman Don Young, Chairman Jim Hansen, and Resources Staff: Tod Hull (he is the one with the dark hair who gave you the book), Allen Freemyer (he is the staff director of the subcommittee), and Rick Healy (Democrat).

Chairman Ralph Regula and Appropriations Committee: Debbie Weatherly, Congressman John Peterson, and Troy Tidwell of his staff, and Congressman George Nethercutt and Glenda Becker of his staff.

Representative Joe Pitts and Representative Joe Hoeffel, Ken Miller with Joe Pitts, and Don Grace with Joe Hoeffel.

State of Pennsylvania: State Representative Bob Flick, State Senator Bob Thompson, and Governor Tom Ridge.

Witnesses at our Hearing: Jim Gallagher of Newtown Square, General George Washington, Dr. Ed Barrs, Historian Emeritus at the Department of Interior, and Students of Exton Elementary, Sugartown Elementary.

Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund: Pat McGuigan, Mike Steinberger (replaced Pat when he retired), Sandra Kelly (works for Malvern Borough), Henry Briggs, Tip O'Neill (the one with the famous name that we couldn't remember last time), and Tom Maguire (historian at Malvern Prep).

Valley Forge Historical Society: Jean-Pierre Bouvel and Ann Brown.

National Park Service: Secretary Bruce Babbitt, Arthur Stewart, Jim Pepper, and Don Barry.

Chester County Commissioners: Colin Hanna, Karen Martynick, and Andrew Dinniman.

School Children: Sugartown Elementary School and the "Footsteps for Paoli", Exton Elementary School and the "Pennies for Paoli", and all of the students from all over the county who wrote letters.

Members from the First Time Round on the Floor: David Dreier, Doc Hastings, and Ralph Hall who helped us obtain a rule, Majority Leader Dick Armey, Jim Traficant for reminding us to Buy American!, Joe Hoeffel, and Joe Pitts.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank the appropriators, especially the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his staff, and particularly Debbie Weatherley and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), who helped us secure the appropriation so that when this bill is being passed today the appropriation is also in the appropriation measure soon to come to the House floor.

So today we complete the final chapter of the battle to remember the cry of saving Paoli, and today I join with my colleagues in supporting the passage of this measure, and I thank everyone who made this day possible.

□ 1415

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) was an invaluable supporter. His staff Todd Hall, who is here with us today, I thank him for all of his efforts; Senator SPECTER and Senator MURKOWSKI on the Senate side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS); the State of Pennsylvania, Governor Ridge who put \$500,000 up from State funds; the county commissioners of Chester County; the Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund, its leaders, Pat McGuigan and Mike Steinberger; the Valley Forge Historical Society, Jean-Pierre Bouvel and Ann Brown; the National Park Service headed up by Secretary Bruce Babbitt; the school children of Sugartown Elementary School and all the children who sent letters and raised over 40,000 pennies to save the Paoli site; and finally those other Members who have been supportive of this effort.

Finally, I would be remiss, Madam Speaker, if I did not mention the last time we had this bill on the floor and it passed the House overwhelmingly, when I was thanking everyone who was involved, in a lapse of memory, which from time to time Members of Congress have, at least this Member does, I gave my key staffer who worked this issue the wrong last name.

So as a final goodwill gesture, I want to thank Aaron for all the work that was done to get the Paoli bill through. The Patriot Act passed, and this time I got Aaron's name right.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend, the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his very, very hard work and tenacious work on this bill. I know this is a happy day for him.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 659, the Patriot Act. I also want to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), for introducing this legislation and taking the lead in protecting these treasures, the Paoli and Brandywine battlefields. He has done a magnificent job of shepherding, of bird-dogging the bill through the legislative process and it was because of his able leadership that we are here today. This bill first came to the floor in June, and it passed overwhelmingly. Today the bill is before us again for the House to adopt a Senate amendment which I also hope the House will support overwhelmingly.

The passage of the Patriot Act is essential for the preservation of two revolutionary war battlefields, Brandywine and Paoli. If we do not preserve these battlefields this year, we will lose both to the rapid development that is taking place in the region. Preserving America's historic treasures is essential if we as a Nation are to remember our past and our rich cultural heritage. It is particularly important to remember the sacrifices that our forefathers made to secure our independence from Great Britain and to build a new country that is today the world leader in freedom and democracy. Brandywine and Paoli battlefields are among the few Revolutionary War battlefields that remain unprotected.

I have visited the Brandywine battlefield in my district, on numerous occasions, and with each visit I am more concerned that America may lose this important piece of our heritage to sprawling housing developments. The Patriot Act will help preserve a portion of the Brandywine battlefield where the most intense conflict and loss of life took place. The battle of the Brandywine was the largest battle of the Revolutionary War in terms of number of participants. Approximately 26,000 British and American troops gathered there. All of the generals were at that battle. It was also a major conflict in the British campaign of 1777, that conquered Philadelphia. While the British eventually took Philadelphia, the battle of the Brandywine was significant in delaying the British campaign and allowing the Congress to abandon the city and to move to Lancaster, also in my district, and then to York, to escape before the British takeover.

History connects people and nurtures identity and community, and I think it is our responsibility to ensure that historical landmarks such as the Brandywine and Paoli battlefields are preserved for future generations. Preserving these battlefields will ensure



that our children and our grandchildren will be able to enjoy and experience how these battles unfolded.

In closing, I want to extend my thanks to the local communities in Chester County, near the Paoli and the Brandywine battlefields, for their unrelenting quest to save these monuments. This has been a grassroots effort, and it is now time for us to help them reach that goal. So I urge support the Patriot Act and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate that this debate is being conducted at a time in 1999 when 200 years prior, in 1799, George Washington was living out his life at Mount Vernon in the last 80 days of that magnificent life. What we do here today is not only go forward with a project that brings pride and will bring additional historic value to Pennsylvania itself and to our Nation as a whole, but also to recall that George Washington was omnipresent at all of these events. He was at Valley Forge, making sure that our stalwarts remained stalwart during that winter. He was at Brandywine defending Pennsylvania and Philadelphia and the Nation, the new Nation yet to be born. He was then destined to become the victor of the Revolutionary War, of course, as Commander-in-Chief. He was the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia, and then became the first President of the United States and for 8 years set the tone and the tradition and the standard for the presidency of the United States.

We here today, in doing something so valuable to our heritage, are in a separate way expressing our gratitude again to George Washington. He died on December 14, 1799. So we are coming to the memorization of that as well, but in the meantime his life was one that is inextricably interwoven with the life of every American, and that extra dividend is being paid to us today when the Congress is making certain that one piece of the Washington legacy, that of Brandywine and Valley Forge and Paoli, that that not only remains in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but in the annals of history and in the minds and hearts of our people as he was first in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON for his extraordinary effort to bring this matter forward. The day this bill is signed into law will be a great day in celebrating American revolutionary history, and this is due to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his efforts here on the floor.

I would also like to thank and congratulate Jean-Pierre Bouvel of the Valley Forge Histor-

ical Society for his leadership in marshalling local support for this public-private partnership. Also thanks to Paul Decker, the Executive Director of the Valley Forge Convention and Visitor Bureau and a number of Montgomery County officials who have given their strong support for this public-private partnership at Valley Forge.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, for his cooperation and efforts on this legislation as well.

The events that occurred on both the Brandywine Battlefield and the Paoli Battlefield were key to the American revolutionary fight for freedom. The American forces lost at Brandywine, although they did buy additional time to protect the city of Philadelphia a little while longer from the British invasion. At Paoli, Americans were massacred at night and it truly was another disastrous defeat for America. Those two military operations forged the beginning of the winning spirit. We are all familiar with the history of the Valley Forge encampment. As far as I am concerned, that is where the American Revolution was truly won. No shots were fired. But the American army that arrived there tired, hungry, ill-clothed, ill-trained and ill-equipped, survived and trained. Six months later, with the tremendous leadership of George Washington, in June of 1778 an effective fighting force went on to win our independence.

So we are saving and preserving the two battlefields that led to the encampment at Valley Forge. We are offering an opportunity to provide a far more impressive visitor experience at Valley Forge. We are providing a greatly improved opportunity for historical artifacts to be presented through a Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution. We will offer better education about the valor, determination, courage and resolve that Americans showed at both those battle sites and the 6 months where they survived a bitter winter at Valley Forge and emerged as an effective fighting army. We will preserve those battlefields so that future generations can appreciate the sacrifices that were made there.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an aye vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 659.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

"An Act to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE OF THE ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT AND WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 795) to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 795

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Chippewa Cree Tribe of The Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act of 1999".*

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds that—*

(1) *in fulfillment of its trust responsibility to Indian tribes and to promote tribal sovereignty and economic self-sufficiency, it is the policy of the United States to settle the water rights claims of the tribes without lengthy and costly litigation;*

(2) *the Rocky Boy's Reservation was established as a homeland for the Chippewa Cree Tribe;*

(3) *adequate water for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation is important to a permanent, sustainable, and sovereign homeland for the Tribe and its members;*

(4) *the sovereignty of the Chippewa Cree Tribe and the economy of the Reservation depend on the development of the water resources of the Reservation;*

(5) *the planning, design, and construction of the facilities needed to utilize water supplies effectively are necessary to the development of a viable Reservation economy and to implementation of the Chippewa Cree-Montana Water Rights Compact;*

(6) *the Rocky Boy's Reservation is located in a water-short area of Montana and it is appropriate that the Act provide funding for the development of additional water supplies, including domestic water, to meet the needs of the Chippewa Cree Tribe;*

(7) *proceedings to determine the full extent of the water rights of the Chippewa Cree Tribe are currently pending before the Montana Water Court as a part of the case "In the Matter of the Adjudication of All Rights to the Use of Water, Both Surface and Underground, within the State of Montana";*

(8) *recognizing that final resolution of the general stream adjudication will take many years and entail great expense to all parties, prolong uncertainty as to the availability of water supplies, and seriously impair the long-term economic planning and development of all parties, the Chippewa Cree Tribe and the State of Montana entered into the Compact on April 14, 1997; and*

(9) *the allocation of water resources from the Tiber Reservoir to the Chippewa Cree Tribe under this Act is uniquely suited to the geographic, social, and economic characteristics of the area and situation involved.*

## SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

*The purposes of this Act are as follows:*

(1) *To achieve a fair, equitable, and final settlement of all claims to water rights in the State of Montana for—*

(A) *the Chippewa Cree Tribe; and*

(B) *the United States for the benefit of the Chippewa Cree Tribe.*

(2) *To approve, ratify, and confirm, as modified in this Act, the Chippewa Cree-Montana*

Water Rights Compact entered into by the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana on April 14, 1997, and to provide funding and other authorization necessary for the implementation of the Compact.

(3) To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute and implement the Compact referred to in paragraph (2) and to take such other actions as are necessary to implement the Compact in a manner consistent with this Act.

(4) To authorize Federal feasibility studies designed to identify and analyze potential mechanisms to enhance, through conservation or otherwise, water supplies in north central Montana, including mechanisms to import domestic water supplies for the future growth of the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation.

(5) To authorize certain projects on the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, Montana, in order to implement the Compact.

(6) To authorize certain modifications to the purposes and operation of the Bureau of Reclamation's Tiber Dam and Lake Elwell on the Marias River in Montana in order to provide the Tribe with an allocation of water from Tiber Reservoir.

(7) To authorize the appropriation of funds necessary for the implementation of the Compact.

#### SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ACT.**—The term "Act" means the "Chippewa Cree Tribe of The Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act of 1999".

(2) **COMPACT.**—The term "Compact" means the water rights compact between the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana contained in section 85-20-601 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997).

(3) **FINAL.**—The term "final" with reference to approval of the decree in section 101(b) means completion of any direct appeal to the Montana Supreme Court of a final decree by the Water Court pursuant to section 85-2-235 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997), or to the Federal Court of Appeals, including the expiration of the time in which a petition for certiorari may be filed in the United States Supreme Court, denial of such a petition, or the issuance of the Supreme Court's mandate, whichever occurs last.

(4) **FUND.**—The term "Fund" means the Chippewa Cree Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement Fund established under section 104.

(5) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term "Indian tribe" has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a(2)).

(6) **MR&I FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The term "MR&I feasibility study" means a municipal, rural, and industrial, domestic, and incidental drought relief feasibility study described in section 202.

(7) **MISSOURI RIVER SYSTEM.**—The term "Missouri River System" means the mainstem of the Missouri River and its tributaries, including the Marias River.

(8) **RECLAMATION LAW.**—The term "Reclamation Law" has the meaning given the term "reclamation law" in section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 701, chapter 4; 43 U.S.C. 371).

(9) **ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION; RESERVATION.**—The term "Rocky Boy's Reservation" or "Reservation" means the Rocky Boy's Reservation of the Chippewa Cree Tribe in Montana.

(10) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, or his or her duly authorized representative.

(11) **TOWE PONDS.**—The term "Towe Ponds" means the reservoir or reservoirs referred to as "Stoneman Reservoir" in the Compact.

(12) **TRIBAL COMPACT ADMINISTRATION.**—The term "Tribal Compact Administration" means the activities assumed by the Tribe for implementation of the Compact as set forth in Article IV of the Compact.

(13) **TRIBAL WATER CODE.**—The term "tribal water code" means a water code adopted by the Tribe, as provided in the Compact.

(14) **TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "Tribal Water Right" means the water right set forth in section 85-20-601 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997) and includes the water allocation set forth in title II of this Act.

(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The definition of the term "Tribal Water Right" under this paragraph and the treatment of that right under this Act shall not be construed or interpreted as a precedent for the litigation of reserved water rights or the interpretation or administration of future compacts between the United States and the State of Montana or any other State.

(15) **TRIBE.**—The term "Tribe" means the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and all officers, agents, and departments thereof.

(16) **WATER DEVELOPMENT.**—The term "water development" includes all activities that involve the use of water or modification of water courses or water bodies in any way.

#### SEC. 5. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) **NONEXERCISE OF TRIBE'S RIGHTS.**—Pursuant to Tribal Resolution No. 40-98, and in exchange for benefits under this Act, the Tribe shall not exercise the rights set forth in Article VII.A.3 of the Compact, except that in the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), the Tribe shall have the right to exercise the rights set forth in Article VII.A.3 of the Compact.

(b) **WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.**—Except to the extent provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 208 of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (43 U.S.C. 666), nothing in this Act may be construed to waive the sovereign immunity of the United States.

(c) **TRIBAL RELEASE OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to Tribal Resolution No. 40-98, and in exchange for benefits under this Act, the Tribe shall, on the date of enactment of this Act, execute a waiver and release of the claims described in paragraph (2) against the United States, the validity of which are not recognized by the United States, except that—

(A) the waiver and release of claims shall not become effective until the appropriation of the funds authorized in section 105, the water allocation in section 201, and the appropriation of funds for the MR&I feasibility study authorized in section 204 have been completed and the decree has become final in accordance with the requirements of section 101(b); and

(B) in the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), the waiver and release of claims shall become null and void.

(2) **CLAIMS DESCRIBED.**—The claims referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Any and all claims to water rights (including water rights in surface water, ground water, and effluent), claims for injuries to water rights, claims for loss or deprivation of use of water rights, and claims for failure to acquire or develop water rights for lands of the Tribe from time immemorial to the date of ratification of the Compact by Congress.

(B) Any and all claims arising out of the negotiation of the Compact and the settlement authorized by this Act.

(3) **SETOFFS.**—In the event the waiver and release do not become effective as set forth in paragraph (1)—

(A) the United States shall be entitled to setoff against any claim for damages asserted by the Tribe against the United States, any funds transferred to the Tribe pursuant to section 104, and any interest accrued thereon up to the date of setoff; and

(B) the United States shall retain any other claims or defenses not waived in this Act or in the Compact as modified by this Act.

(d) **OTHER TRIBES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this Act is intended to quantify or otherwise adversely affect the land and water rights, or claims or entitlements to land or water of an Indian tribe other than the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

(e) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—In implementing the Compact, the Secretary shall comply with all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and all other applicable environmental Acts and regulations.

(f) **EXECUTION OF COMPACT.**—The execution of the Compact by the Secretary as provided for in this Act shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The Secretary is directed to carry out all necessary environmental compliance required by Federal law in implementing the Compact.

(g) **CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.**—Nothing in this Act is intended to prohibit the Tribe from seeking additional authorization or appropriation of funds for tribal programs or purposes.

(h) **ACT NOT PRECEDENTIAL.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted as a precedent for the litigation of reserved water rights or the interpretation or administration of future water settlement Acts.

### TITLE I—CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE OF THE ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT

#### SEC. 101. RATIFICATION OF COMPACT AND ENTRY OF DECREE.

(a) **WATER RIGHTS COMPACT APPROVED.**—Except as modified by this Act, and to the extent the Compact does not conflict with this Act—

(1) the Compact, entered into by the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana on April 14, 1997, is hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed; and

(2) the Secretary shall—

(A) execute and implement the Compact together with any amendments agreed to by the parties or necessary to bring the Compact into conformity with this Act; and

(B) take such other actions as are necessary to implement the Compact.

(b) **APPROVAL OF DECREE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States, the Tribe, or the State of Montana shall petition the Montana Water Court, individually or jointly, to enter and approve the decree agreed to by the United States, the Tribe, and the State of Montana attached as Appendix 1 to the Compact, or any amended version thereof agreed to by the United States, the Tribe, and the State of Montana.

(2) **RESORT TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT.**—Under the circumstances set forth in Article VII.B.4 of the Compact, 1 or more parties may file an appropriate motion (as provided in that article) in the United States district court of appropriate jurisdiction.

(3) **EFFECT OF FAILURE OF APPROVAL TO BECOME FINAL.**—In the event the approval by the appropriate court, including any direct appeal, does not become final within 3 years after the filing of the decree, or the decree is approved but is subsequently set aside by the appropriate court—

(A) the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States shall be null and void; and

(B) except as provided in sections 105(e)(1), 5(a), and 5(c)(3), this Act shall be of no further force and effect.

#### SEC. 102. USE AND TRANSFER OF THE TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.

(a) **ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.**—As provided in the Compact, until the adoption and approval of a tribal water code by the Tribe, the



Secretary shall administer and enforce the Tribal Water Right.

(b) TRIBAL MEMBER ENTITLEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any entitlement to Federal Indian reserved water of any tribal member shall be satisfied solely from the water secured to the Tribe by the Compact and shall be governed by the terms and conditions of the Compact.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—An entitlement described in paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Tribe pursuant to a tribal water code developed and adopted pursuant to Article IV.A.2 of the Compact, or by the Secretary pending the adoption and approval of the tribal water code.

(c) TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statutory or common law, the Tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary and subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact, including limitation on transfer of any portion of the Tribal Water Right to within the Missouri River Basin, enter into a service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement providing for the temporary delivery, use, or transfer of the water rights confirmed to the Tribe in the Compact, except that no service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement entered into under this subsection may permanently alienate any portion of the Tribal Water Right.

**SEC. 103. ON-RESERVATION WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized and directed to plan, design, and construct, or to provide, pursuant to subsection (b), for the planning, design, and construction of the following water development projects on the Rocky Boy's Reservation:

(1) Bonneau Dam and Reservoir Enlargement.

(2) East Fork of Beaver Creek Dam Repair and Enlargement.

(3) Brown's Dam Enlargement.

(4) Towe Ponds' Enlargement.

(5) Such other water development projects as the Tribe shall from time to time consider appropriate.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary, at the request of the Tribe, shall enter into an agreement, or, if appropriate, renegotiate an existing agreement, with the Tribe to implement the provisions of this Act through the Tribe's annual funding agreement entered into under the self-governance program under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) by which the Tribe shall plan, design, and construct any or all of the projects authorized by this section.

(c) BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that the Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has entered into an agreement with the Tribe, pursuant to title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.)—

(A) defining and limiting the role of the Bureau of Reclamation in its administration of the projects authorized in subsection (a);

(B) establishing the standards upon which the projects will be constructed; and

(C) for other purposes necessary to implement this section.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The agreement referred to in paragraph (1) shall become effective when the Tribe exercises its right under subsection (b).

**SEC. 104. CHIPPEWA CREE INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation to be known as the "Chippewa Cree Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement Trust Fund".

(B) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary for management and investment on behalf of the Tribe and distribution to the Tribe in accordance with this Act.

(ii) AVAILABILITY.—Funds made available from the Fund under this section shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

(2) MANAGEMENT OF FUND.—The Secretary shall deposit and manage the principal and interest in the Fund in a manner consistent with subsection (b) and other applicable provisions of this Act.

(3) CONTENTS OF FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund under section 105(a) and such other amounts as may be transferred or credited to the Fund.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—The Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary, may withdraw the Fund and deposit it in a mutually agreed upon private financial institution. That withdrawal shall be made pursuant to the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(5) ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish the following accounts in the Fund and shall allocate appropriations in the various accounts as required in this Act:

(A) The Tribal Compact Administration Account.

(B) The Economic Development Account.

(C) The Future Water Supply Facilities Account.

(b) FUND MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) AMOUNTS IN FUND.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund and allocated to the accounts of the Fund by the Secretary as provided in this Act and in accordance with the authorizations for appropriations in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 105(a), together with all interest that accrues in the Fund.

(B) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall manage the Fund, make investments from the Fund, and make available funds from the Fund for distribution to the Tribe in a manner consistent with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(2) TRIBAL MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Tribe exercises its right pursuant to subsection (a)(4) to withdraw the Fund and deposit it in a private financial institution, except as provided in the withdrawal plan, neither the Secretary nor the Secretary of the Treasury shall retain any oversight over or liability for the accounting, disbursement, or investment of the funds.

(B) WITHDRAWAL PLAN.—The withdrawal plan shall provide for—

(i) the creation of accounts and allocation to accounts in a fund established under the plan in a manner consistent with subsection (a); and

(ii) the appropriate terms and conditions, if any, on expenditures from the Fund (in addition to the requirements of the plans set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c)).

(c) USE OF FUND.—The Tribe shall use the Fund to fulfill the purposes of this Act, subject to the following restrictions on expenditures:

(1) Except for \$400,000 necessary for capital expenditures in connection with Tribal Compact Administration, only interest accrued on the Tribal Compact Administration Account referred to in subsection (a)(5)(A) shall be available to satisfy the Tribe's obligations for Tribal Compact Administration under the provisions of the Compact.

(2) Both principal and accrued interest on the Economic Development Account referred to in subsection (a)(5)(B) shall be available to the Tribe for expenditure pursuant to an economic development plan approved by the Secretary.

(3) Both principal and accrued interest on the Future Water Supply Facilities Account referred

to in subsection (a)(5)(C) shall be available to the Tribe for expenditure pursuant to a water supply plan approved by the Secretary.

(d) INVESTMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) APPLICABLE LAWS.—The Secretary shall invest amounts in the Fund in accordance with—

(i) the Act of April 1, 1880 (21 Stat. 70, chapter 41; 25 U.S.C. 161);

(ii) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the payment of interest of certain funds held in trust by the United States for Indian tribes", approved February 12, 1929 (25 U.S.C. 161a); and

(iii) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the deposit and investment of Indian funds", approved June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a).

(B) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS TO THE FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations of the United States held in the Fund shall be credited to and form part of the Fund. The Secretary of the Treasury shall credit to each of the accounts contained in the Fund a proportionate amount of that interest and proceeds.

(2) CERTAIN WITHDRAWN FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts withdrawn from the Fund and deposited in a private financial institution pursuant to a withdrawal plan approved by the Secretary under the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) shall be invested by an appropriate official under that plan.

(B) DEPOSIT OF INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held under this paragraph shall be deposited in the private financial institution referred to in subparagraph (A) in the fund established pursuant to the withdrawal plan referred to in that subparagraph. The appropriate official shall credit to each of the accounts contained in that fund a proportionate amount of that interest and proceeds.

(e) AGREEMENT REGARDING FUND EXPENDITURES.—If the Tribe does not exercise its right under subsection (a)(4) to withdraw the funds in the Fund and transfer those funds to a private financial institution, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tribe providing for appropriate terms and conditions, if any, on expenditures from the Fund in addition to the plans set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

(f) PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No part of the Fund shall be distributed on a per capita basis to members of the Tribe.

**SEC. 105. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) CHIPPEWA CREE FUND.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Fund, \$21,000,000 to be allocated by the Secretary as follows:

(1) TRIBAL COMPACT ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNT.—For Tribal Compact Administration assumed by the Tribe under the Compact and this Act, \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

(2) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT.—For tribal economic development, \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

(3) FUTURE WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES ACCOUNT.—For the total Federal contribution to the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of a future water supply system for the Reservation, there are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(B) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(C) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(b) ON-RESERVATION WATER DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, for the construction of the on-Reservation water development projects authorized by section 103—

(A) \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, for the planning, design, and construction of the

Bonneau Dam Enlargement, for the development of additional capacity in Bonneau Reservoir for storage of water secured to the Tribe under the Compact;

(B) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, for the planning, design, and construction of the East Fork Dam and Reservoir enlargement, of the Brown's Dam and Reservoir enlargement, and of the Towe Ponds enlargement of which—

(i) \$4,000,000 shall be used for the East Fork Dam and Reservoir enlargement;

(ii) \$2,000,000 shall be used for the Brown's Dam and Reservoir enlargement; and

(iii) \$2,000,000 shall be used for the Towe Ponds enlargement; and

(C) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, for the planning, design, and construction of such other water resource developments as the Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary, from time to time may consider appropriate or for the completion of the 4 projects enumerated in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(2) UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Any unexpended balance in the funds authorized to be appropriated under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), after substantial completion of all of the projects enumerated in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 103(a)—

(A) shall be available to the Tribe first for completion of the enumerated projects; and

(B) then for other water resource development projects on the Reservation.

(c) ADMINISTRATION COSTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, for the costs of administration of the Bureau of Reclamation under this Act, except that—

(1) if those costs exceed \$1,000,000, the Bureau of Reclamation may use funds authorized for appropriation under subsection (b) for costs; and

(2) the Bureau of Reclamation shall exercise its best efforts to minimize those costs to avoid expenditures for the costs of administration under this Act that exceed a total of \$1,000,000.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund and allocated to its accounts pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deposited into the Fund and allocated immediately on appropriation.

(2) INVESTMENTS.—Investments may be made from the Fund pursuant to section 104(d).

(3) AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MONEYS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a)(1) shall be available for use immediately upon appropriation in accordance with subsection 104(c)(1).

(4) LIMITATION.—Those moneys allocated by the Secretary to accounts in the Fund or in a fund established under section 104(a)(4) shall draw interest consistent with section 104(d), but the moneys authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) shall not be available for expenditure until the requirements of section 101(b) have been met so that the decree has become final and the Tribe has executed the waiver and release required under section 5(c).

(e) RETURN OF FUNDS TO THE TREASURY—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), all unexpended funds appropriated under the authority of this Act together with all interest earned on such funds, notwithstanding whether the funds are held by the Tribe, a private institution, or the Secretary, shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury 12 months after the expiration of the deadline established in section 101(b).

(2) INCLUSION IN AGREEMENTS AND PLAN.—The requirements in paragraph (1) shall be included in all annual funding agreements entered into under the self-governance program under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.),

withdrawal plans, withdrawal agreements, or any other agreements for withdrawal or transfer of the funds to the Tribe or a private financial institution under this Act.

(f) WITHOUT FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—All money appropriated pursuant to authorizations under this title shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

#### SEC. 106. STATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SETTLEMENT.

Consistent with Articles VI.C.2 and C.3 of the Compact, the State contribution to settlement shall be as follows:

(1) The contribution of \$150,000 appropriated by Montana House Bill 6 of the 55th Legislative Session (1997) shall be used for the following purposes:

(A) Water quality discharge monitoring wells and monitoring program.

(B) A diversion structure on Big Sandy Creek.

(C) A conveyance structure on Box Elder Creek.

(D) The purchase of contract water from Lower Beaver Creek Reservoir.

(2) Subject to the availability of funds, the State shall provide services valued at \$400,000 for administration required by the Compact and for water quality sampling required by the Compact.

#### TITLE II—TIBER RESERVOIR ALLOCATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES AUTHORIZATION

##### SEC. 201. TIBER RESERVOIR.

(a) ALLOCATION OF WATER TO THE TRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall permanently allocate to the Tribe, without cost to the Tribe, 10,000 acre-feet per year of stored water from the water right of the Bureau of Reclamation in Lake Elwell, Lower Marias Unit, Upper Missouri Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Montana, measured at the outlet works of the dam or at the diversion point from the reservoir. The allocation shall become effective when the decree referred to in section 101(b) has become final in accordance with that section. The allocation shall be part of the Tribal Water Right and subject to the terms of this Act.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tribe setting forth the terms of the allocation and providing for the Tribe's use or temporary transfer of water stored in Lake Elwell, subject to the terms and conditions of the Compact and this Act.

(3) PRIOR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.—The allocation provided in this section shall be subject to the prior reserved water rights, if any, of any Indian tribe, or person claiming water through any Indian tribe.

(b) USE AND TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF ALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact and this Act, the Tribe shall have the right to devote the water allocated by this section to any use, including agricultural, municipal, commercial, industrial, mining, or recreational uses, within or outside the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(2) CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statutory or common law, the Tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary and subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact, enter into a service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement providing for the temporary delivery, use, or transfer of the water allocated by this section, except that no such service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement may permanently alienate any portion of the tribal allocation.

(c) REMAINING STORAGE.—The United States shall retain the right to use for any authorized purpose, any and all storage remaining in Lake Elwell after the allocation made to the Tribe in subsection 201(a).

(d) WATER TRANSPORT OBLIGATION; DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY COSTS.—The United States shall have no responsibility or obligation to pro-

vide any facility for the transport of the water allocated by this section to the Rocky Boy's Reservation or to any other location. Except for the contribution set forth in subsection 105(a)(3), the cost of developing and delivering the water allocated by this title or any other supplemental water to the Rocky Boy's Reservation shall not be borne by the United States.

(e) SECTION NOT PRECEDENTIAL.—The provisions of this section regarding the allocation of water resources from the Tiber Reservoir to the Tribe shall not be construed as precedent in the litigation or settlement of any other Indian water right claims.

#### SEC. 202. MUNICIPAL, RURAL, AND INDUSTRIAL FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) STUDY.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall perform an MR&I feasibility study of water and related resources in north central Montana to evaluate alternatives for a municipal, rural, and industrial supply for the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(B) USE OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be deemed to apply to MR&I feasibility study activities for which funds were made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

(2) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The MR&I feasibility study shall include the feasibility of releasing the Tribe's Tiber allocation as provided in section 201 into the Missouri River System for later diversion to a treatment and delivery system for the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(3) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STUDIES.—The MR&I feasibility study shall include utilization of existing Federal and non-Federal studies and shall be planned and conducted in consultation with other Federal agencies, the State of Montana, and the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OR PARTICIPATION IN IDENTIFIED OFF-RESERVATION SYSTEM.—The United States, the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and the State of Montana shall not be obligated to accept or participate in any potential off-Reservation water supply system identified in the MR&I feasibility study authorized in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 203. REGIONAL FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall conduct, pursuant to Reclamation Law, a regional feasibility study (referred to in this subsection as the "regional feasibility study") to evaluate water and related resources in north central Montana in order to determine the limitations of those resources and how those resources can best be managed and developed to serve the needs of the citizens of Montana.

(2) USE OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—The authority under paragraph (1) shall be deemed to apply to regional feasibility study activities for which funds were made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The regional feasibility study shall—

(1) evaluate existing and potential water supplies, uses, and management;

(2) identify major water-related issues, including environmental, water supply, and economic issues;

(3) evaluate opportunities to resolve the issues referred to in paragraph (2); and

(4) evaluate options for implementation of resolutions to the issues.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Because of the regional and international impact of the regional feasibility study, the study may not be segmented. The regional study shall—

(1) utilize, to the maximum extent possible, existing information; and

(2) be planned and conducted in consultation with all affected interests, including interests in Canada.

**SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEASIBILITY STUDIES.**

(a) *FISCAL YEAR 1999 APPROPRIATIONS.*—Of the amounts made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$1,000,000 shall be used for the purpose of commencing the MR&I feasibility study under section 202 and the regional study under section 203, of which—

(1) \$500,000 shall be used for the MR&I study under section 202; and

(2) \$500,000 shall be used for the regional study under section 203.

(b) *FEASIBILITY STUDIES.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, for the purpose of conducting the MR&I feasibility study under section 202 and the regional study under section 203, \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, of which—

(1) \$500,000 shall be used for the MR&I feasibility study under section 202; and

(2) \$2,500,000 shall be used for the regional study under section 203.

(c) *WITHOUT FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.*—All money appropriated pursuant to authorizations under this title shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

(d) *AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MONEYS.*—The amounts made available for use under subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been available for use as of the date on which those funds were appropriated. The amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (b) shall be available for use immediately upon appropriation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Rocky Boy's water rights settlement process has been important for a number of reasons. The gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the State of Montana, and the tribe have spent a good deal of time working through the issues in a constructive fashion, taking steps to minimize the impact on other affected water users. Furthermore, there has been minimal emphasis on some of the outmoded bases for calculating Federal Reserve Indian water right claims. This process has allowed the parties to look to newer, more flexible negotiations that find solutions which provide tribes with real opportunities without making demands that may destroy the economic livelihood of existing water users.

Additionally, this process has brought new solutions and introduced private sector expertise into the tribe's efforts to utilize these water supplies once the settlement is authorized. By approaching these Indian water right settlements in more creative ways, Congress and the Federal Government can narrow the divergent expectations of the parties as they enter negotiations and attempt to correct problems that have existed for decades. It is important for Congress to modernize the process and bases for settling these claims. It is taking far too long to arrive at a settlement. Often tribes receive water and money under cir-

cumstances that do not ultimately help them realize the benefits of the broader economy. It is the intention that this settlement will help the tribe reach their goal of self-determination. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I commend my good friend, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), for his hard, hard work on this legislation. It balances all the interests so very carefully, and I commend him for bringing it to this point.

This legislation provides for a comprehensive settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation in Montana. Under the terms of this legislation, Congress would approve and authorize participation in a water rights compact entered into by the tribe and the State of Montana. The compact recognizes the tribe's rights to approximately 10,000 acre feet of water on the reservation, and provides for specific water development projects and funding to benefit the tribe.

The future water rights of the tribe are also provided for in this bill. The Chippewa Cree Tribe, the State of Montana, and representatives from the Department of Interior have worked very, very hard for many years to secure agreement on this water rights settlement.

Again, the work of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) has brought this to a culmination. H.R. 795 provides an opportunity to ratify the first Indian water settlement since the early 1990s, and I urge my colleagues to support enactment of this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the distinguished author of the legislation.

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. Madam Speaker, as the sponsor of this bill, I rise in strong support of H.R. 795, the Chippewa Cree Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act, which is a companion to a bill in the Senate, 438. I especially want to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and his staff Bob Faber and Josh Johnson for their tireless efforts to work with all the parties involved that has allowed us to move this important piece of legislation.

This bill is the culmination of many years of technical and legal work and many years of negotiations involving the Chippewa Cree Tribe, the State of

Montana and representatives of the United States Departments of Interior and Justice. The bill will ratify a settlement that quantifies the water rights of the tribe and provides for the development in a manner that would be consistent with their neighbors, the needs of the local communities and farmers and ranchers. It provides Federal funds for construction of water supply facilities and for tribal economic development and defines the Federal Government's role in implementing that settlement. This settlement bill has the full support of the tribe, the State of Montana, the Department of Justice, the Department of Interior and the water users who farm and ranch on streams shared with the reservation.

This bill will effectuate a settlement that is a textbook example of how State, tribal and Federal governments can work together to resolve that difference in a way that meets the concerns of all. It is also a settlement that reflects the effectiveness of tribal and nontribal water users in working together in goodwill and in good faith with respect to each other's needs and concerns.

□ 1430

It is not an overstatement to say that the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act is a historic agreement. This is truly a great occasion for all those who have worked so hard to get us to this point.

In closing, again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DOOLITTLE), the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), and the House leadership for scheduling the bill today. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his cosponsorship and helping to move this bill forward and urge its adoption.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote; I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 795, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2140) to improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

# SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia is a nationally significant resource;

(2) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area has been adversely affected by land use changes occurring inside and outside the recreation area;

(3) the population of the metropolitan Atlanta area continues to expand northward, leaving dwindling opportunities to protect the scenic, recreational, natural, and historical values of the 2,000-foot-wide corridor adjacent to each bank of the Chattahoochee River and its impoundments in the 48-mile segment known as the "area of national concern";

(4) the State of Georgia has enacted the Metropolitan River Protection Act to ensure protection of the corridor located within 2,000 feet of each bank of the Chattahoochee River, or the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain, whichever is larger;

(5) the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain includes the area of national concern;

(6) since establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, visitor use of the recreation area has shifted dramatically from waterborne to water-related and land-based activities;

(7) the State of Georgia and political subdivisions of the State along the Chattahoochee River have indicated willingness to join in a cooperative effort with the United States to link existing units of the recreation area through a series of linear corridors to be established within the area of national concern and elsewhere on the river; and

(8) if Congress appropriates funds in support of the cooperative effort described in paragraph (7), funding from the State, political subdivisions of the State, private foundations, corporate entities, private individuals, and other sources will be available to fund more than half the estimated cost of the cooperative effort.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to increase the level of protection of the open spaces within the area of national concern along the Chattahoochee River and to enhance visitor enjoyment of the open spaces by adding land-based linear corridors to link existing units of the recreation area;

(2) to ensure that the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area is managed to standardize acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the linear corridors; and

(3) to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds to cover a portion of the costs of the Federal, State, local, and private cooperative effort to add additional areas to the recreation area so as to establish a series of linear corridors linking existing units of the recreation area and to protect other open spaces of the Chattahoochee River corridor.

# SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ACT.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—Section 101 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii), is amended—

(1) in the third sentence, by inserting after "numbered CHAT-20,003, and dated September 1984," the following: "and on the maps entitled 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #1', 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #2', and 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #3', and dated August 6, 1998,'";

(2) by striking the fourth sentence and inserting the following: "No sooner than 180 days after the date of enactment of this sentence, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') may modify the boundaries of the recreation area to include other land within the Chattahoochee River corridor by submitting a revised map or other boundary description to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives. The revised map or other boundary description shall be prepared by the Secretary after consultation with affected landowners, the State of Georgia, and affected political subdivisions of the State. The revised boundaries shall take effect 180 days after the date of submission unless, within the 180-day period, Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the revised boundaries."; and

(3) in the next-to-last sentence, by striking "may not exceed approximately 6,800 acres." and inserting "may not exceed 10,000 acres.".

(b) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.—Section 102 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-1), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "from willing sellers" after "purchase"; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 103 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-2), is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Georgia, political subdivisions of the State, and other entities to ensure standardized acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the recreation area."

(d) FUNDING.—Section 105 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii-4), is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 105. (a)" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 105. FUNDING SOURCES AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

"(a) FUNDING.—

"(1) LIMITATION ON USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "\$79,400,000" and inserting "\$115,000,000";

(B) by striking "this Act" and inserting "this title"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept a donation of funds or land or an interest in land to carry out this title.

"(3) RELATION TO OTHER FUNDING SOURCES.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to funding and the donation of land and interests in land by the State of Georgia, local government authorities, private foundations, corporate entities, and individuals for purposes of this title."; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking "(c) Within" and inserting the following:

"(c) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

"(1) INITIAL PLAN.—Within";

(C) in paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (B)), by striking "transmit to" and all that follows through "Representatives" and inserting "transmit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) REVISED PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Within 3 years after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall submit to the committees specified in paragraph (1) a revised general management plan to provide for the protection, enhancement, enjoyment, development, and use of the recreation area.

"(B) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In preparing the revised plan, the Secretary shall encourage the participation of the State of Georgia and affected political subdivisions of the State, private landowners, interested citizens, public officials, groups, agencies, educational institutions, and other entities."

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Title I of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii et seq.), is amended—

(1) in sections 102(d) and 103(a), by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

(2) in section 104(b)—

(A) by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

(B) by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title";

(C) by striking "by this Act" and inserting "by this title"; and

(D) by striking "in this Act" and inserting "in this title";

(3) in section 104(d)(2), by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title";

(4) in section 105(c)(1)(A), as redesignated by subsection (d)(3), by striking "of this Act" and inserting "of this title";

(5) in section 106(a), by striking "in this Act" and inserting "in this title"; and

(6) in section 106(d), by striking "under this Act" and inserting "under this title".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2140, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is to be commended for crafting a bill which amends the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Act by modifying the boundaries of the area and to provide for the lands, waters, and scenic resources, and to provide protection for these within the recreation area.

Visitor enjoyment and protection of the river would be enhanced by adding land-based links between current units of the national recreation area. This bill also assures the recreation area is managed by forming cooperative agreements with State, local, and other entities.

The Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area attracts thousands of visitors year-round. The recreation area has seen a substantial increase in use, becoming one of the most visited national recreation areas in the country.

H.R. 2140 will also enhance the protection for the scenic and recreational values of the Chattahoochee River corridor from developmental pressures.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 2140 modifies the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area with the intention of providing for the inclusion of land within 2,000 feet of each bank of the Chattahoochee River on a 48-mile segment in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia.

At the hearing on H.R. 2140 on July 20, 1999, the National Park Service testified in support of the legislation as introduced, with one technical change. As amended by the Committee on Resources, one substantive change and a number of technical and conforming changes have been made to the bill. The one substantive change is the new requirement that land could only be acquired on a willing-seller basis.

As the National Park Service noted in its testimony, there are cases of potentially severe and irreparable damage to resources that can only be prevented through the use of eminent domain. Given that rapid development and urbanization of the area, threats to these resources are a real danger.

The National Park Service also noted that, although eminent domain authority at Chattahoochee currently exists, it has never been used, and the National Park Service hopes it never will be. By tying the National Park Service's hands on acquisitions, we could open up the area to developers and speculators who can name their price with no recourse.

However, Madam Speaker, overall, H.R. 2140 is a good bill, and I would hate to see the bill hung up on this point. I understand that the Senate companion legislation has language on this point that the administration supports. Hopefully, this can be resolved so action on the measure can be completed and a bill sent to the President that has the support of all parties.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, H.R. 2140. This legislation would modify the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area to protect and preserve the endangered Chattahoochee River and provide additional recreation opportunities for the citizens of Georgia and our nation. The river and its corridor lands are a vital source of water for the City of Atlanta, and more broadly for all of north Georgia. The area hosts diverse wildlife, significant natural communities and irreplaceable historic resources in the midst of one of America's most vibrant urban areas. It also affords a recreational haven for the millions of visitors each year to the dozen or so non-contiguous parkland areas that together comprise the Chattahoochee Recreation Area.

Congress established the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in 1978 to preserve and protect the natural, scenic, recreational, historic, and other values of a 48-

mile segment of one of our nation's great urban rivers. Six years later, in 1984, as development around and within the recreation area increased, Congress acted to facilitate State and local government efforts to protect the area by declaring the 2,000-foot-wide corridor adjacent to each bank of the Chattahoochee as an area of national concern. Now, due to the rapid pace of commercial and residential development in the Chattahoochee River corridor, I believe it is absolutely essential that we pass this legislation in order to provide additional protection for this important resource. I have sought to continue former Speaker Gingrich's efforts to preserve the Chattahoochee River by funding the Chattahoochee Greenways Project, which will keep land on the banks of the river from further development and help clean up the waterway.

This legislation is essential because over the years there has been a shift from largely water-based to land-based use of the park by visitors to the area, thereby contributing to a need for a larger land base for recreation. H.R. 2140 would expand the recreation area and protecting most of the remaining open spaces along the river corridor. The goal of the legislation is to create as much of an uninterrupted stretch of land as possible along the river banks in order to meet increased demand for recreational opportunities by communities along the river.

This legislation also promotes private-public partnerships since Congress appropriated \$25 million for land acquisition along the Chattahoochee last year and this will be matched by private funds. Remarkable cooperative efforts are currently underway to protect key lands in the corridor of Georgia's Chattahoochee River from Buford Dam to the Florida border. Thanks to the tireless efforts and leadership of the Trust for Public Land, the State of Georgia, private foundations, corporate entities, private individuals, and others have already given or pledged tens of millions of dollars to secure properties of public significance within the current authorized boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and to preserve the river for future generations of Georgians to enjoy.

I would like to thank Representative NATHAN DEAL for introducing this important legislation and his efforts to protect one of Georgia's most indispensable natural resources. I am grateful for past efforts of Governor Zell Miller, Lt. Governor Pierre Howard, and for the efforts of other members of the Georgia delegation and Congress at large in support of this important legislation. I believe Congress must act fast to enact this legislation in order to protect the Chattahoochee River from any further development and environmental damage.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, for the consideration on the floor today of an issue important to the State of Georgia and myself. H.R. 2140 is legislation I introduced earlier this year to improve the protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area.

The Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area was established August 15, 1978, and boundary adjustments were made in October 1984. The recreation area is along a 48-mile stretch of the Chattahoochee River within four counties, north and northeast of Atlanta, Georgia. The area immediately adjacent to the park is being heavily developed, and Forsyth County (which I represent) is the fastest grow-

ing county in the United States. The park currently contains about 9,238 acres of which approximately 4,500 are Federally owned. Presently, the park includes thirteen separate land units. Popular recreational activities in the park include fishing, hiking, picnicking, canoeing, rafting, tubing, and boating. It also contains a number of natural habitats, 19th century historic sites and ruins, as well as Native American archaeological sites. Annual visitation is about 3.5 million visitors.

My legislation would modify the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and authorize the creation of a greenway buffer between the river and private development to prevent further pollution, provide flood and erosion control, and maintain water quality for safe drinking water and for the fish and wildlife dependent on the river system. In addition, this legislation promotes private-public partnerships by authorizing \$25 million in federal funds for land acquisition for the recreation area. The \$25 million will be matched by private funds. The State of Georgia, private foundations, corporate entities, private individual, and others have already given or pledged tens of millions of dollars to protect and preserve the Chattahoochee river for future generations of Georgians to enjoy. At the same time, it includes an "any willing seller" provision to protect private property rights of landowners.

Last year, in anticipation of passage of this legislation, Congress made available \$25 million for land acquisition in the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area. That funding is serving to leverage state, local government, and private funding to further augment land purchases in the recreation area. However, legislative authority expanding the boundaries is needed before the additional land can be purchased. We can help preserve one of Georgia's most vital natural resources by enacting H.R. 2140.

Similar legislation was introduced in the House and Senate during the 105th Congress. As most of you know, the House passed the legislation in October 1998, however the Senate did not act on the measure.

During this Congress, Senator COVERDELL introduced the companion bill to H.R. 2140 (S. 109), and the bill was reported on June 7, 1999 by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. I believe it is crucial for the House to act quickly on this legislation in order to protect the Chattahoochee River from further development and environmental damage.

Again, thank you Madam Speaker, and thank you to the Resources Committee members and staff for all the help they provided with H.R. 2140. I would also like to thank Representative ISAKSON for his assistance in protecting one of Georgia's most vital, natural resources.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2140, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

# NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION COUNCIL EXPAN- SION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2821) to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2821

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "North American Wetlands Conservation Council Expansion Act of 1999".

## SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVA- TION COUNCIL.

(a) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4403(a)(1)) is amended by striking "nine" and inserting "eleven".

(b) APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Section 4(a)(1)(D) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4403(a)(1)(D)) is amended by striking "three" and inserting "five".

(c) INITIAL TERMS.—Of the members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council first appointed under the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)—

(1) one shall be appointed to an initial term of 1 year; and

(2) one shall be appointed to an initial term of 2 years, as specified by the Secretary of the Interior at the time of appointment.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING APPOINTMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (e), this section shall not affect section 304 of the Wetlands and Wildlife Enhancement Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2958; 16 U.S.C. 4403 note).

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304 of the Wetlands and Wildlife Enhancement Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2958; 16 U.S.C. 4403 note) is amended by striking "shall consist of" and inserting "shall include".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House H.R. 2821, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The fundamental goal of this legislation is to diversify and expand the effectiveness of the North American Wetlands Council by increasing from three to five the number of nongovernmental

representatives that may serve on that body.

Under current law, there are nine members, including the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, who serve on the Wetlands Council. Their job is to review and recommend worthwhile conservation projects to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

To date, the commission has approved 714 projects to protect, restore, and enhance critical wetland habitat in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This represents a financial commitment of \$310.8 million that has been matched by more than 900 nongovernmental partners, for a total investment of \$798.5 million. These funds have been used to conserve over 33 million acres of wetlands which directly benefit millions of migratory birds.

By expanding the membership of the Wetlands Council, two additional conservation groups would be given a seat at the table, and they would bring with them their commitment to accelerate the growth of this extremely successful program.

H.R. 2821 is a noncontroversial and bipartisan bill that has been authored by the two House Members who serve with distinction on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

I urge an "aye" vote on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, the council established under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has made tremendous positive impact in helping to restore and conserve wetlands across the North American continent. Projects supported by the council help to preserve wetlands and provide crucial forage and resting habitats for migratory birds, not only in our Nation, but also in Canada and Mexico.

H.R. 2821 would simply add two additional nongovernmental seats to the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, thereby increasing the size of the council from 9 to 11 members in total. There would be no increase in the current number of two permanent seats in the council, which are reserved for the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the executive secretary of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

It is my understanding from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that this increase in nongovernmental seats is considered an appropriate step in order to provide new opportunities for public participation on the council by a broader number of charitable and nongovernmental organizations. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the administration does not oppose this increase in seats.

As such, the bill appears to be straightforward and noncontroversial.

Since the only intention of this bill is to increase the number of opportunities for nonprofit participation in the council, I strongly support this legislation.

By all measures, the North American Wetlands Conservation Council has proven itself to be a very effective and strong advocate for wetlands conservation and restoration. I believe most, if not all, Members of this House can agree that the modest increase in nonprofit seats proposed by this legislation would be a positive enhancement to this extremely successful council. I urge all members to vote "aye" on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), one of the principal sponsors of the legislation.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding me this time, and let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his help in getting this bill to the floor today.

I rise to pay a very appropriate thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), author of this legislation.

I have had the pleasure for the past several sessions of the Congress representing the Republican side of the aisle on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, where the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has had a tremendous career in providing leadership to this body for preserving flyaway space for the migratory birds in North America.

Madam Speaker, there is no other program that I can think of that enjoys such bipartisan support in voluntarily protecting land for birds and for wildlife and habitat.

We in this body tend to get in disagreements from time to time over the issue of takings and over the issue of forcing property owners to make their land available for the public. Well, this program is the exact opposite.

The father of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), if I am not mistaken, was the initiator of this entire program decades ago. This program, started by the father of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and supported by the late Silvey Oconte, who were both tireless advocates for conservation issues in America, has provided the ability of our Government to protect over 34 million acres of land, 34 million acres of land, without taking anyone's property without their consent, but by simply entering into agreements where we bring conservation groups together so they can use the leverage to provide other funds, matched in such cases by State and local governments, to protect this land for migratory birds.



We now have a massive network of open space that would not have been protected were it not for this legislation, were it not for this program. What the bill of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) does, which I am very proud to be a cosponsor of, is it allows for the expansion of this council, to make sure that those conservation groups who are most heavily involved maintain their seats on this oversight board that recommends projects to us.

I will be remiss if I did not mention, Madam Speaker, Ducks Unlimited. Ducks Unlimited has put millions of dollars into programs that have allowed us to voluntarily protect land as provided for by the legislation of the North Americans Wetlands Conservation Act and by the role that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I play on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Groups like Ducks Unlimited need to be a part of this process. This legislation allows for the expansion of the council for two more seats so that Ducks Unlimited, hopefully, will be able to maintain that seat in the future.

Once again, I rise in strong support of this. I urge all my Republican colleagues and, really, all of our colleagues to join in enthusiastically voting for the legislation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), which is right. It is important for our country. I think it also speaks to his leadership following in his father's footsteps on conservation issues for America.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the U.S. House of Representatives. I might add the youngest dean in this century.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his friendship and for what he has done to move this legislation forward.

I also want to compliment and commend the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member; the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans; and of course the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

I want to say what a pleasure it is for me to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who serves on the Migratory Bird Commission.

This is a relatively small piece of legislation. Its purpose is very simple, and that is to see to it that we have enough participation by private conservation organizations which work so hard to

see to it that this particular program works.

NAWCA is an extremely valuable program which has set aside, with the full consent of the landowners, millions of acres of land in the United States, in Canada, and in Mexico.

□ 1445

And it has done so with the good will of all involved; conservationists, government agencies, Federal, State and local, private individuals, and landowners are for what this has done. It has been a tremendous assist to the conservation movement in this country and is saving lands for very important purposes.

I want to say again what a pleasure it has been to work with my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has consistently been a great voice for conservation and who has worked wonderfully well with me and with the other members of the Migratory Bird Commission, which is one of the most successful land procurement agencies in the whole history of American government. The fact that so few know about it tends to prove that we work so well that there is really no cause for complaint in the acquisition of the millions of acres of land.

The function of the legislation before us is not to cost the Federal Government money. It will not. Rather, it will allow the Secretary of the Interior to use two additional slots to appoint organizations that will help make sound wetland conservation decisions and will draw in new organizations and organizational strength and achieve additional commitments towards further cooperative investments in reclaiming wetlands and wildlife habitat. This is, in that very small but very important particular, a very important but valuable piece of legislation, and I would commend the committee for its labors in bringing it forth.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has given me all too much credit in this matter and who is my full partner in the business of the Migratory Bird Commission representing the House and also to observe that the commission is served very well by two of our good friends and colleagues in the Senate who have participated actively in the efforts to achieve this particular end.

So this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I think we will be pleased with what we have done when we look back on the successes that this has brought us.

Madam Speaker, today we have before us a relatively small bill to make a significant conservation program even more successful. H.R. 2821, the North American Wetlands Conservation Council Expansion Act, would make a modest improvement to a conservation law that has successfully saved wetlands throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico during the past decade.

I want to thank Chairman DON YOUNG and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER of the

House Resources Committee for allowing this legislation to come before the House so swiftly. Together with the assistance of Fisheries Subcommittee Chairman JIM SAXTON and Ranking Member ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, their support for this legislation means a lot, and I hope it sends a strong message to the other body for favorable consideration.

NAWCA [naw-ka] was signed into law in 1989 in response to the finding that more than half of the original wetlands in the United States have been lost during the past two centuries. Congress recognized that protection of migratory birds and their habitats required long-term planning and coordination so that our treaty obligations to conserve these precious species would be met.

The purpose of NAWCA is to encourage partnerships among public and non-public interests to protect, enhance, restore and manage wetlands for migratory birds and other fish and wildlife in North America. NAWCA has been a tremendous success, funding 629 projects between 1991 and 1999, helping to restore, enhance or help approximately 34 million acres across our continent. Most impressive has been the ratio of partner-to-government contributions, which has been about \$2.50 for every public dollar invested.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the most effective means to diversify and expand the effectiveness of the Council is to provide the Secretary with new authority to appoint two additional Council members under Sec. 4(a)(1)(D) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. These appointments would give the Service the ability to include additional charitable and non-profit organizations from among the many which actively participate in the development of NAWCA projects.

A little more than one year ago I first learned of the Fish and Wildlife Service's desire to promote change in the NAWCA program when the agency announced its intent not to reappoint two non-governmental organizations that played key roles in making NAWCA a cornerstone of American conservation success. I was greatly concerned that any replacement of Council members under NAWCA should not serve as a disincentive to continued active participation in meeting the Act's goals.

CBO has indicated that increasing the size of the NAWCA Council will not cost the federal government any money. Rather, it is my intention to allow the Secretary of Interior to use these two additional slots to appoint organizations that will make sound wetland conservation decisions and promote additional commitments toward cooperative investment in reclaiming these habitats.

I want to conclude by praising the hard work of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, the staffs of its member organizations, and those staff of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who have devoted themselves to the fulfillment of NAWCA's goals. Congress reauthorized NAWCA last year because its success during the first decade was clearly evident, and because the need for wetlands conservation is even clearer today than it was a decade ago. I hope that H.R. 2821 will provide a non-controversial, easy-to-approve mechanism to accelerate the growth of this magnificent program.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2821, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 659, H.R. 795, H.R. 2140, and H.R. 2821, the four bills just debated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT REGARDING ADOPTED ALIENS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2886) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an adopted alien who is less than 18 years of age may be considered a child under such Act if adopted with or after a sibling who is a child under such Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2886

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PROVIDING THAT AN ADOPTED ALIEN WHO IS LESS THAN 18 YEARS OF AGE MAY BE CONSIDERED A CHILD UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IF ADOPTED WITH OR AFTER A SIBLING WHO IS A CHILD UNDER SUCH ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by inserting “(i)” after “(E)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) subject to the same proviso as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (F)(i); (II) was adopted by the adoptive parent or parents of the sibling described in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child was adopted while under the age of eighteen years; or”; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by inserting “(i)” after “(F)”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) subject to the same provisos as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (E)(i); (II) has been adopted abroad, or is coming to the United States for adoption, by the adoptive parent (or prospective adoptive parent) or parents of the sibling de-

scribed in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child is under the age of eighteen at the time a petition is filed in his or her behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO NATURALIZATION.—

(1) DEFINITION OF CHILD.—Section 101(c)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(c)) is amended by striking “sixteen years,” and inserting “sixteen years (except to the extent that the child is described in subparagraph (E)(ii) or (F)(ii) of subsection (b)(1)).”.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CITIZENSHIP.—Section 322(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1432(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “16 years” and inserting “16 years (except to the extent that the child is described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1))”; and

(B) by striking “subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1).” and inserting “either of such subparagraphs.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2886, a bill introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), amends the Immigration and Nationality Act and provides that an older child who is 16 or 17 years old may be adopted with or after the adoption of a younger sibling who is a child under such act.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act permits a foreign-born child who has been adopted by a United States citizen parent to be classified as an immediate relative child for purposes of immigration to the United States. To qualify, the child must be under the age of 16 at the time an immigrant visa petition is filed on the child's behalf.

Since most parents prefer to adopt infants or very young children, older children constitute a relatively small portion of the adoptive children admitted as immigrants. However, in cases involving siblings, adoptive parents often wish to adopt the older child or children in order to keep the family group intact. If the oldest child happens to be 16 or 17, there is no way under current law for that child to immigrate to the United States.

A typical case would likely involve a group of siblings, one 16 or 17 years old who had been orphaned. A United States citizen family is willing to adopt all of the siblings in order to keep them together but, under current law, the oldest child cannot immigrate to the United States. The result would be either separation of the older child from the sibling group or, in cases where foreign adoption authorities will not prevent the separation of siblings, the U.S. citizen loses the opportunity to adopt any of the children.

The bill authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) would allow

minor orphaned siblings to stay together when being adopted by U.S. citizens. The bill would allow a 16- or 17-year-old child to qualify as an immediate relative child if the U.S. citizen parents have also adopted a sibling of that child who is under the age of 16.

This bill thus would achieve the goal of maintaining family unity in a relatively small number of cases involving the adoption of siblings one of whom is age 16 or 17 at the time the adoptive parents file immigrant visa petitions on the children's behalf, and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 2886.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for his hard work in sponsoring this bill and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for shepherding this bill through committee and now bringing this to the floor for consideration.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides immigration and naturalization benefits for the alien children of United States citizens. The word child, however, is a term of art with various definitions. In order to be considered a child in the basis of an adoption, an alien must be an unmarried person under 21 years of age who is adopted while under the age of 16 years. This bill would expand the definition of an adopted child to include an adoptive person between the ages of 16 and 18, provided that the child who is between 16 and 18 is a natural sibling of a child adopted while under the age of 16.

This bill would achieve a worthwhile purpose. If a United States citizen adopts a 15-year-old child, they should also be able to obtain immigration benefits for the child's 17-year-old sibling if they adopt the sibling too. Since most parents prefer to adopt infants, or very young children, older children constitute a relatively small portion of the adopted children admitted as immigrants.

According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, out of a total of 11,316 immigrant orphans admitted in fiscal year 1996, only 351 were age 10 or older. However, in cases involving siblings, adoptive parents frequently wish to adopt the older child or children in order to keep a family group intact. If the oldest sibling happens to be 16 or 17, there is no way under current law that the child can immigrate to the U.S. This bill would change that.

H.R. 2886 will further the goal of maintaining family unity in the relatively small number of cases involving the adoption of siblings, one of whom is 16 or 17 at the time the adoptive parents file visa petitions on the children's behalf.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his supportive comments.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that my colleagues have unanimously supported this legislation 404 to 0.

Foreign adoption provides many U.S. citizens with the opportunity not only to experience the joys of parenthood but also to provide their children with a better life in the United States.

As the author of H.R. 2886, a bipartisan bill, we have provided for an expansion of these opportunities. The intent of the bill is to allow immigrant orphan siblings to stay together when they are being adopted by U.S. citizens.

Under current law, a U.S. citizen may bring an immigrant child they have adopted to the United States if the child is under the age of 16. This legislation would allow U.S. citizens to adopt immigrant children ages 16–17 if the adoption would keep a group of siblings together.

Family unity is a frequently cited goal of our immigration policy, and this proposal would promote that goal. The typical case this proposal would help is a group of siblings who were orphaned in their home country—or their parents became unable to care for them. If the children are adopted by U.S. citizens and the oldest sibling is 16 or 17, the oldest sibling cannot come to the United States with his or her brothers and sisters under current law. It does not make sense for siblings to be separated because of an arbitrary age limit.

Moreover, some foreign adoption authorities do not allow the separation of siblings. In such a case, if a U.S. citizen wanted to adopt a group of siblings and one of them is 16 or older, the citizen would lose the opportunity to adopt any of them under current law.

This bill is unlikely to cause a significant increase in immigration levels overall. During fiscal year 1996, a total of 351 immigrant orphans older than age 9 were adopted by U.S. citizens, out of 11,316 immigrant orphans adopted by U.S. citizens overall that year. Although the number of families helped by this bill may be relatively small, the chance to keep a group of brothers and sisters together would mean a great deal to these families.

I thank the House leadership for scheduling H.R. 2886 on the suspension calendar today. I also appreciate the support and assistance of Judiciary Committee Chairman HENRY HYDE, Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Immigration and Claims Subcommittee Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and Subcommittee Ranking Member SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

We have all done the right thing—immigrant families and America will gain.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2886, legislation introduced by my colleague, Representative HORN

(R-CA). This legislation would promote adoption and improve the lives of hundreds of children by allowing immigrant orphan siblings to stay together when being adopted by U.S. citizens.

Under current law, a U.S. citizen may bring an immigrant child they have adopted to the United States only if the child is under the age of 16. If a group of siblings are orphaned in their home country, for example, and those children are adopted by U.S. citizens, any siblings aged 16 or older cannot come to the United States with their brothers and sisters under current law. Mr. Chairman, orphaned siblings should not be separated because of an arbitrary age limit. Representative HORN's legislation would allow U.S. citizens to adopt immigrant children ages 16–17 if the adoption would keep a group of siblings together. This legislation would go a long way towards ensuring that orphaned siblings join permanent families.

Madam Speaker, this legislation would produce an important change in our nation's immigration policy, but its most significant impact is deeply personal. My own mother was orphaned at a young age, and was separated from her siblings as a result. Through her experience, and later through my own experience as the adoptive father of two beautiful Korean children, I have come to appreciate family unity as precious to parents and children alike. Although the number of families helped by this bill may be relatively small, keeping even one group of siblings together will have an immeasurable impact on those children's lives. As a cosponsor of H.R. 2886 and an adoptive parent, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2886.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON STATE INCOME TAXATION OF PENSION INCOME

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 462) to clarify that governmental pension plans of the possessions of the United States shall be treated in the same manner as the State pension plans for purposes of the limitation on the State income taxation of pension income.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 462

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON STATE INCOME TAXATION OF PENSION INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 114(b)(1) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon “or any plan which would be a governmental plan (as so defined) if possessions of the United States were treated as States for purposes of such section 414(d)”.

(b) CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR.—Section 114 of such title 4 is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (c).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 462, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I recall that in the 104th Congress, I suppose 2½ years ago, we introduced and had passed both in the House and the Senate, and signed into law, a measure which would guaranty that an individual who earns a pension, for instance in the State of California, and then moves for the remainder of one's life to another State, the bill that we introduced and passed would prevent California from reaching out and taxing the proceeds of that pension of a person no longer living in California.

We learned, to our dismay, that there were hundreds and thousands of people who, after their retirement and moving to another State, found that they were being pursued by a taxing authority of the State in which they earned the pension. Well, we cured that situation and passed, on a bipartisan basis, a measure originally introduced by our colleague, Mrs. Vucanovich, as I recall; and everyone seemed happy about it because we solved a very difficult problem.

But as we did that, it was brought to our attention that our commonwealths, like Puerto Rico and the other territories of the United States, were not accorded the same privileges as we embedded in this particular piece of legislation. What we do here today is simply bring that up to date to cover Puerto Rico and the other territories, so that someone retiring in Puerto Rico, who goes to another State, or vice versa, will not have that odious tentacle of taxation from the working State to the retirement State follow that individual.

In this endeavor to bring this matter to a close and close that little loop-hole, we were importuned by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), as well as the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), the resident commissioner of Puerto Rico, and that completed the cycle. The bill that is in front of us now extends that special tax benefit, shall we say, to everyone who has ever worked in the United States or its territories.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, this legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) on February 2, 1999. It would make a technical correction to the legislation enacted in the 104th Congress which exempted from income tax certain retirement income paid to a non-resident of the State in which the retirement income was earned.

□ 1500

The proposed legislation merely clarifies that governmental plans, that is public employee retirement plans, includes plans provided by governments of possessions of the United States.

The original bill only applied to States and, thus, excluded retirees from governmental entities of U.S. possessions. It would address the situation now faced by retirees from Puerto Rico who now reside in the United States who are unable to take advantage of the benefits of this law on par with the other retirees.

This bill has strong bipartisan support, it is technical in nature, and would grant equal treatment to retirees similarly situated.

I urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 462.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. GERALD R. FORD

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 196) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 196

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on October 27, 1999, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am moving this resolution for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) who represents the area of Grand Rapids, which was the area that Gerald R. Ford represented as a Member of the House of Representatives and as its minority leader.

I think it is entirely appropriate that the Presidential Congressional Gold Medal be awarded to President and Mrs. Ford.

Congressman Ford wound up President Ford in one of the most unique series of events in the history of the United States. Congressman Ford was appointed Vice President of the United States according to the 25th Amendment, and then Vice President Ford became President Ford upon the resignation of President Nixon.

I will soon conclude my time and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) will have an opportunity to talk about this particular representative from Michigan.

I have known President Ford for some time. I knew him briefly before he became President, and I have known him for some time after he became President. He is one of those individuals of which we have many on the floor of the House who are professionals. That is, they go about the business of representing their constituents in a professional fashion.

That is one of the reasons Jerry Ford rose to be minority leader and why when there was a need to fill the vice presidential slot in a time of national trouble that they turned to Jerry Ford and that, in one of the saddest periods I believe that, notwithstanding his being appointed to the two highest offices in the land, he conducted himself

and his presidency in exemplar fashion, and that he should have been rewarded, in the humble opinion of this gentleman from California, the presidency through the electoral process.

That was not to be. But the people of the United States owe President Ford a great debt of gratitude on the way in which he conducted himself as an appointed Vice President and as an appointed President.

It is entirely appropriate that, in the rotunda on October 27, President Ford and Mrs. Ford will receive the Congressional Gold Medal.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, President Gerald and Mrs. Betty Ford are two of the finest people I have ever known. They came, as I do, from Michigan, great citizens of Michigan.

I happen to have had the great pleasure of serving with the brother of President Gerald Ford, Tom Ford, in the Michigan Legislature; and, in that fashion, I met Gerald Ford many, many times when he was minority leader here in the House where he conducted himself very, very well, was chosen, in a wise decision, to become the Vice President of the United States, and then succeeded to the presidency of the United States.

He and his wife brought to the White House exactly what America needed at that time. They brought decency and a concern and helped heal this Nation. This Nation and I personally are grateful to President Gerald and Mrs. Betty Ford for what they have done for this country. They certainly deserve this medal and certainly deserve this ceremony in the rotunda.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 196, to reserve the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a Congressional Gold Medal to our distinguished former President, Gerald R. Ford, and our former First Lady, Betty Ford, for their "dedicated public service and outstanding humanitarian contributions to the people of the United States."

I was among the more than 300 cosponsors of legislation, enacted on October 21, 1998, to authorize this honor.

Since the American Revolution, Congress has commissioned Gold Medals as its highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions. Each medal is individually struck to honor a particular individual or individuals, institution, or notable event.

President Ford is the first former President to be so honored during his lifetime, and this is also the first time that a President and First Lady have been honored jointly.

Congress has awarded Gold Medals to several distinguished men during their military careers who would later go on to become Presidents of the United States:

George Washington, by the Continental Congress before the Revolutionary War began

in 1776; Andrew Jackson in 1815; William Henry Harrison, in 1818; Zachary Taylor, three times, in 1846, 1847, and 1848; and Ulysses S. Grant, in 1863.

President Harry S. Truman was honored posthumously in 1984.

Mrs. Ford will be the second First Lady to be so honored; the first was Lady Bird Johnson in 1984.

Gerald Ford is, of course, best known for his service as the 38th President of the United States who attempted to move the Nation past the scars left by the Watergate scandal.

He was the first person in history to have been appointed Vice President of the United States to fill a vacancy, pursuant to the 25th amendment to the Constitution.

He was confirmed in that office by vote of this House and of the Senate.

He was also the first person to have assumed the Presidency, in 1974, without having been elected to national office. As such, Gerald Ford served the Nation for two years and five months as President under very trying political circumstances.

But Gerald Ford is best known to this chamber as a "Man of the House", who served from 1949 to 1973 as a Representative from Michigan and from 1965 to 1973 as minority leader of the House.

While Representative Ford could be tough and partisan, he represented a tradition of bipartisanship and friendship across the aisle which served the House and the Nation well for many years. His accession to the Presidency was welcomed with joy by Members of Congress from both parties.

In his retirement, the former President has often spoken out against the divisiveness and harsh partisanship which have enveloped our political institutions in the decades after he left office, and which have so damaged the national interest.

Betty Ford, a model of an outspoken and courageous First Lady in the White House, is perhaps best known since her retirement for showing Americans who suffer from personal despair that recovery is possible.

She established the Betty Ford Center, to help those seeking to reestablish productive lives after suffering from drug dependency.

She has been active in many philanthropic causes.

Madam Speaker, the Fords were perhaps the first modern "First Family" to jointly lead both active public and private lives once out of office, and they established a pattern for other Presidents and spouses to follow in the future.

They set a worthy example of service to America, and I am pleased to support our action today in approving this ceremony to recognize their achievements.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 196, which will allow us to use the Rotunda to present a fitting tribute to President and Mrs. Gerald Ford—the Congressional Golf Medal. I would like to thank Mr. EHLERS, who now represents the Grand Rapids area, for his work on this measure.

We are all aware of President Ford's political accomplishments: a 25 year career in the House of Representatives, serving as vice-president and then president. Throughout his career he represented Michigan and this country with dignity and was a great example to those that have followed in his footsteps in this House. He will forever be associated with

the University of Michigan, and he always carried this pedigree proudly. President Ford ascended to the highest office in the land during one of the most turbulent periods in our political history, and it is the grace that he and his wife Betty comported themselves that is perhaps their greatest legacy. President Ford restored a sense of stability to the office that was absolutely essential for both domestic and foreign relations. Among her many accomplishments, Mrs. Ford's dedication to helping others fight the terrible effects of breast cancer and substance abuse is well-known, and is illustrative of the caring decency this family came to represent.

Madam Speaker, Gerald Ford answered the call when his country needed it most. His example of professionalism in the worst of circumstances helped the United States through one of its worst constitutional crises. I look forward to seeing this wonderful couple receive this well-deserved award, and I join my colleagues and the citizens of this country in thanking them for their devoted service.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 196.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 196.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COBURN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree, to the extent within the scope of the conference, to provisions that—

(1) reduce nonessential spending in programs within the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and other related agencies;

(2) reduce spending on international organizations, in particular, in order to honor the commitment of the Congress to protect Social Security; and

(3) do not increase overall spending to a level that exceeds the higher of the House bill or the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion to instruct is parliamentary procedure only to reemphasize the importance of the process that we presently find ourselves.

Today, unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the Foreign Operations bill and with that veto he made the statement that we did not have enough money in the funding for the things that he wanted in terms of foreign operations. As we have struggled this year to limit the spending in this Congress so that we do not touch Social Security money, part of the way we have done that is to flat-line the amount of money that is spent on the Foreign Operations bill. In fact, it is the only bill that we sent to the President that is somewhat less than the spending from the year before. That bill, as I recall, was \$200 million less than what we actually spent last year.

As we think about the options, spending money and the \$1.7 trillion budget that we have, I think it is important to look at what the President said in his own statement of administration policy which was issued August 4, 1999, in terms of his desires for the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill which this motion to instruct is directed at. On the second page of that,

he talks about international affairs programs which ties back into what he vetoed today in terms of the Foreign Operations bill. It is his message that the "committee underfunds activities to support the ongoing conduct of effective diplomacy and does not fully fund payments to international organizations necessary to ensure U.S. leadership in international affairs."

This weekend I happened to share my weekend on call that I do every 4 weeks in my medical practice in Oklahoma. Starting Friday night about 11:30 and finishing up about 4:30 this morning, 10 young Oklahomans came into this world. The debate we are going to be having with the President, whether we want to or not and whether we talk about it now or whether we talk about it in the future, is going to be focused on these 10 young lives. The fact is that the Congress and the President all too often make decisions in the short term and in the short run. What we find in the Commerce, Justice, State bill is many international organizations. I thought I would just kind of look at what the bill as coming out of the House funded in terms of international organizations and affairs programs that the President objected to. I just want to spend a minute talking about those.

There is \$1,949,000 for funding the following programs: The International Copper Study Group, the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Lead and Zinc Study Group, the International Rubber Organization, the International Office of the Wine and Vine, the International Rubber Study Group, the International Seed Testing Association, the International Tropical Timber Organization, and the International Grains Council. The amount provided includes funding for travel and for arrears.

As we looked into some of these, I think it is very important that the American public knows what these organizations do and, remember, this money very likely, if the President has his way, will come from the future benefits of these 10 babies that I delivered this weekend. Their future is going to be compromised, because we are going to borrow money from their future to actually pay for this \$1,949,000.

Let me give my colleagues a little outline of what the International Office of the Wine and Vine does. First of all, remember that the wine industry in America exports \$537 million worth of wine each year and it is growing each year. In 1999 we sent \$64,000 to this international organization. I want Members to know what we got for our money so we did a little research. It turns out that the International Office for the Wine and Vine wrote the rules for the chardonnay of the world competition. That is a healthy, very important thing for our taxpayers and these 10 new babies from Oklahoma to be saddled with in the future. A qualitative confrontation of the world's best chardonnay. That is where the Amer-

ican taxpayer's dollars are going. But that is not all. The International Office of the Wine and Vine also wrote a press release touting a Danish study that confirmed that the consumption of wine has health benefits. Well, our own Surgeon General said that 15 years ago. We know that. And actually that was all we could find that they actually did for 1999 for \$64,000.

Now, let us talk about the rubber. The administration has proposed funding not one but two rubber organizations dedicated to supporting the rubber supply industry; not the rubber manufacturing industry but the rubber supply industry. We spent \$300,000 on the International Rubber Organization last year, \$111,000 on the International Rubber Study Group. The first organization we spent \$300,000. What is their job? To keep the price of rubber high. To keep the price of raw rubber high. We are a total importer of rubber. Raw rubber, we produce no raw rubber in the United States, so we spent \$300,000 asking that organization to help keep the price of our imports high.

The third organization, the International Copper Study Group established in 1992, we spent \$77,000. What did we get for our money, you ask? According to the web site, you can order a number of products from the International Copper Study Group. We spent \$77,000, but you cannot get any of that information unless you pay them big-time bucks. \$350 for a report, a directory of the copper mines in this country is \$350, and if you want to use their database, another \$550. The American taxpayer has already paid for it. These dollar figures do not sound like much, but when we put it in perspective, it does.

I want to pull up a couple of charts for a minute and let the Members of the House see just in these international organizations, 475 American families, their tax rate if the average family is earning \$55,000, they are paying \$4,100 in Federal income taxes, that is what they are paying to fund this. Looking at it a different way, the average senior in this country earns \$9,396, receives that in terms of Social Security payments. If we look at the amount of seniors, that is the equivalent of shipping 207 seniors' receipts overseas, for programs that the President wants us to spend more money on in terms of international organizations.

Mr. President, we are not going to spend a penny of Social Security. This motion to instruct is to reaffirm what the House has already done and to say that we are going to stand by the appropriated amounts and not go any higher than the House level. The Senate version actually is somewhat lower. We would expect you to be a better steward of our international monies. All we have to do is look at what has happened in Russia. We do not need more money for foreign aid because the money that we are sending in foreign aid, whether it be through the Inter-

national Monetary Fund, whether it is through the World Bank, we are not a good steward of it. All we have to do is trace the \$3 to \$4 billion that has been absconded from the money that we sent to Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is interesting to note that in anticipation of this debate, the House and Senate conferees took a break to be able to come here and speak about this issue. So from the onset, it should be noted that the work of the conferees is not being done at this moment because we have to be here to be dealing with what, in all due respect to the gentleman, I consider a waste of time.

The fact of life is that there is a process, a process where the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill and under our system we sit down to work it out. The gentleman does what he considers a good job at singling out some items that, if we look at any budget, could be for some people questionable items. But this is the Commerce, Justice, State, Federal Judiciary, Census Bureau, INS, FCC, FTC, NOAA, this is a bill that encompasses so much, that to single out some items that he may think are not proper and then try to in fact instruct the conferees to go out and destroy the bill is totally improper. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in strong opposition to the motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill.

This is, as I said, a waste of time. Conferees are unable to meet because we have to be on the floor. On the motion, I would be interested in knowing what programs of, say, the Justice Department the gentleman from Oklahoma considers nonessential. For that matter, how would the gentleman from Oklahoma define "nonessential"? I expect his definition would not agree with mine or with that of the administration. Does nonessential mean unauthorized? Much of the Justice Department is unauthorized. Does nonessential mean mostly salaries and expenses of Federal employees? The FBI is mostly salaries and expenses.

The second item in the motion suggests that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks U.S. engagement with the world is of little importance. I wonder that after the Senate's failure to ratify the comprehensive test ban treaty last week, the gentleman also wishes to put the House on record as also favoring withdrawal from world leadership and refusal to meet our membership obligations to the various international organizations.

On the third point, it has been clear from the beginning that the allocations within which the House and Senate wrote their bills were too low and, therefore, unacceptable to many Democrats and certainly to the President. If Republicans are truly interested in getting the appropriations bills passed,



they will have to compromise with the Senate and the White House. That is a fact. Doing as the gentleman suggests moves us in the opposite direction.

I would remind the gentleman that while he has strong views on spending restraint, which I respect, and while this motion may actually pass because it is not binding so it is basically free, the votes are not there to pass bills that look the way he wants them to look.

I urge my colleagues not to support this motion and to have a fuller understanding of what this whole process is about. I would urge the gentleman to take a closer look at the various departments and agencies and the significance of this whole bill rather than to single out something which he feels is not proper and therefore should destroy a whole bill and a whole process.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I find it very interesting that we did not specifically hear a denial of the claims that I made just in this one program. I was trying to be very, very general and not going into details on a lot of programs because that in fact is the priority of the appropriations process. I also was one that happened to vote to send this bill to conference.

But I would also note that the gentleman from New York did not agree that we should reduce nonessential spending, he did not agree that we should reduce spending on international organizations that are wasteful, that do not have a purpose for our children and our future, and he did not say that he was opposed to increasing the spending. Where does he think the money is going to come from? The money is going to come from these 10 children I delivered this weekend. They are going to pay for it.

The fact is if we want to talk about authorizations, the reason the appropriations process is so hard is because the Congress does not do its job in terms of sending authorizations to the appropriators. And, in fact, if we followed the strict rules of the House and did not give a rule on every appropriation bill that would not make it a point of order to strike those bills which are appropriated that are unauthorized, we would in fact have a budget that is much easier to handle, we would be doing our jobs in terms of the authorization committees, and we would not be forced to play the line to where we have to walk up to the edge of stealing Social Security money.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am in opposi-

tion to this motion. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has just said, we had to interrupt a meeting of the conferees that Members of the Senate and the House who are downstairs in Room H-140 of this building in the Capitol; we had to interrupt the deliberations almost as we were concluding in order to rush up here to discuss this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, we are already working to do as the gentleman in his motion hopes. We are working within the overall framework set by the leadership to meet all of the relevant goalposts including saving Social Security. We are working to reduce spending for nonessential programs. And if the gentleman would like to attend the conference, I will invite him as my guest to sit at the table and to observe the nonessential spending that we have already cut from this bill, particularly several hundred million dollars worth of items that were in the Senate bill that no longer exists because the House conferees insisted that that nonessential spending be cut.

We are working to preserve funding for critical law enforcement programs. The Senate bill was a billion dollars below the House for the Department of Justice; that is the FBI, that is the DEA, that is the INS; that is most of the law enforcement of the Federal Government in this country is in this bill. We have managed to get that money back in place in this conference.

Mr. Speaker, we are working to get a bill that is acceptable to both the House and the Senate, and that is a job in and of itself because the bodies passed radically different bills. And we are trying to mesh them into something that both bodies can now agree on those changes. We are working to give our best shot to produce a bill that has a shot at least of being signed into law by the President. So my colleagues have to take into account in this divided government the desires of the administration; there is no way around that.

We are working to do all that I have talked about and to spend as few dollars as possible, but the fundamental point is that we are working within the framework laid down by our leadership that will meet the targets for spending and protecting Social Security, as the gentleman wants.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask of the body:

Let us do our job. Let us bring our work to a conclusion, I hope tonight, and then we will lay it on the floor here, hopefully tomorrow, and let our colleagues judge the bill and vote up or down on the product that we produce.

So the process is working. We are going to see the product tonight or tomorrow, and then our colleagues can make their judgment. But beforehand to try to prejudice what the conferees are doing in the middle of our work is a little bit like saying to Picasso while he is half finished with a painting, "Let's throw it out, it's not worth

looking at." I do not want to be compared to Picasso, but let us finish our work, and then my colleagues can judge it according to their desires at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the motion to instruct conferees so that we can go back to work and finish this bill tonight.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just be very brief; I have no speakers. I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Kentucky, if he wants to compare me to Picasso, I do not have a problem with that.

But to suggest that when we try to deal with the expenditures of government, and I might say just to be clear that the chairman and I are going through a process right now where we do not agree on how we are spending some dollars; that is the nature of our system. But that does not mean that I would try to impede his ability to do his job by having a motion like this one or that he would try to do the same with me. To suggest that somehow we are going to raid the Social Security system, I think we did that when we tried to tell the American people that the only thing they should get is a tax break and that nothing else mattered. That is the real danger. I do not think paying for the FBI, I do not think paying for the Immigration Department is necessarily creating that kind of a problem; and I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be the closing speaker, so would the gentleman like to yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The first point I want to address is the motion to instruct is an approved parliamentary procedure, and I hope the gentleman from New York would grant me the right to use the procedures within the House that are available to me to try to do a motion to instruct. We have the rules of the House, and this otherwise would not have been approved and would have been stricken down.

The next thing I would say is the American people need to know where we are on this. Last year we spent \$34.9 billion on CJS, this appropriation bill, and what passed the House was 35.7 billion. The House passed that. What we are saying with this motion to instruct is: Do not go any higher.

Now we understand my colleagues have been given the ability within the conference to go to \$37.2 billion; we understand that. What we are saying is: If we are ever going to control the spending, if we are ever going to truly balance the budget, let alone not touch Social Security, because what the American people do not know is just because Social Security is not being

spent this year, that does not mean the Inland Waterway Trust money is not being spent and the retirement program for all Federal workers that are unfunded is not being spent that we are going to have to come back and get sometime. All these things are still not accounted for, and even though we do not spend one penny of Social Security, the national debt is still going to rise something like \$40 billion this year.

So we can claim that we are not going to touch Social Security, but is that good enough for our children?

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to see this one graph because it tells greatly what our problem is. If we do not become frugal with our taxpayers' money and with our children's money, look what happens in the year 2014. That is when the amount of money coming in for Social Security and the amount going out starts exceeding. So we would not have the ability to spend Social Security money in 2014 because the amount going to seniors would be less than what is coming in, and if we look out to about the year 2030, what we see is a trillion dollars a year in general tax revenues. A trillion dollars above and beyond what is paid in Social Security is going to have to be available to take care of our seniors, and we have not begun to address the problems associated with Medicare.

So what we are trying to do is to slow the increase in the Commerce Justice State appropriation to about a 2 percent increase instead of a 6.6 percent, which is about to come out of conference.

Is it not interesting in our country when the Senate passes a bill at \$33.7 billion, and the House passes a bill at \$35.7 billion, and when they get together the tendency is, we are going to spend \$2.5 billion more, and that is exactly what is getting ready to come out of that conference.

So again, I would ask the Members to think about the new children born across this country in the last 72 hours and what are we leaving them. We can do better, we have to do better, and this motion to instruct says do not spend one penny we do not have to, do not send money overseas for the International Wine and Vine or the International Rubber Council because it does not benefit Americans. It is a token we throw down in the international market that brings us no benefit.

I am not an isolationist, and I believe that America has to lead the world, but if we are bankrupt, how can we lead the world? And this is too important of an issue. We should not walk away from it. We should walk up to the line, and we should make sure that we secure the future for our children.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma, in offering this motion to instruct conferees, talked about some of the international programs that will be covered by the conference report.

However, reading the Coburn motion, I note that it also would instruct conferees to "reduce

nonessential spending in programs within the departments of Commerce" as well as other Departments. Unfortunately, it does not indicate what programs might be meant.

In considering the motion, I must wonder whether it is aimed at making even further cuts in funding for NOAA's research programs, such as those carried out in its own labs or through cooperation with the University of Colorado and other universities. Because it's impossible to say whether NOAA is outside the scope of the motion, I cannot support the motion.

Similarly, I have to wonder whether the motion is intended to instruct the conferees to make further cuts in funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Is funding for NIST something that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks is not essential? Again, it's impossible to tell, so once again I cannot support the motion.

And what about the Justice Department and the Judiciary? What funding for law enforcement and the courts does my colleague think is not essential? I think that having that kind of information would make it easier to decide about this motion to instruct the conferees—and, yet again, without that kind of information, I cannot support this motion to instruct the conferees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until after the recorded votes on three suspension motions postponed earlier today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3064. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3064) "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30,

2000, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. INOUE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 307(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5877(c)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which covers activities that occurred in fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1999.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2606, the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000."

The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel dangers, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

This bill rejects all of those principles. It puts at risk America's 50-year tradition of leadership for a safer, more prosperous and democratic world. It is an abandonment of hope in our Nation's capacity to shape that kind of world. It implies that we are too small and insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and prosperity.

In the short term, H.R. 2606 fails to address critical national security needs. It suggests we can afford to underfund our efforts to keep deadly weapons from falling into dangerous hands and walk away without peril from our essential work toward peace in places of conflict. Just as seriously, it fails to address America's long-term interests. It reduces assistance to nations struggling to build democratic societies and open markets and backs away from our commitment to help people trapped in poverty to stand on their feet. This, too, threatens our security because future threats will come from regions and nations where instability and misery prevail and future opportunities will come from nations on the road to freedom and growth.

By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition. For if we underfund our diplomacy, we will end up overusing our military. Problems we might have been able to resolve peacefully will turn into crises we can only resolve at a cost of life and treasure. Shortchanging our arsenal of peace is as risky as shortchanging our arsenal of war.

The overall funding provided by H.R. 2606 is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan in 1985, and it is 14 percent below the level that I requested. I proposed to fund this higher level within the budget limits and without spending any of the Social Security surplus. The specific shortfalls in the current bill are numerous and unacceptable.

For example, it is shocking that the Congress has failed to fulfill our obligations to Israel and its neighbors as they take risks and make difficult decisions to advance the Middle East peace process. My Administration, like all its predecessors, has fought hard to promote peace in the Middle East. This bill would provide neither the \$800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation nor the \$500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River Agreement. Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process. We should instead seize this opportunity to support them.

Additional resources are required to respond to the costs of building peace in Kosovo and the rest of the Balkans, and I intend to work with the Congress to provide needed assistance. Other life-saving peace efforts, such as those in Sierra Leone and East Timor, are imperiled by the bill's inadequate funding of the voluntary peacekeeping account.

My Administration has sought to protect Americans from the threat posed by the potential danger of weapons proliferation from Russia and the

countries of the former Soviet Union. But the Congress has failed to finance the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI), which is designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction and weapons technologies from falling into the wrong hands and weapons scientists from offering their talents to countries, or even terrorists, seeking these weapons. The bill also curtails ETRI programs that help Russia and other New Independent States strengthen export controls to avoid illicit trafficking in sensitive materials through their borders and airports. The ETRI will also help facilitate withdrawal of Russian forces and equipment from countries such as Georgia and Moldova; it will create peaceful research opportunities for thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists. We also cannot afford to underfund programs that support democracy and small scale enterprises in Russia and other New Independent States because these are the very kinds of initiatives needed to complete their transformation away from communism and authoritarianism.

A generation from now, no one is going to say we did too much to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safeguard their nuclear technology and expertise. If the funding cuts in this bill were to become law, future generations would certainly say we did too little and that we imperiled our future in the process.

My Administration has also sought to promote economic progress and political change in developing countries, because America benefits when these countries become our partners in security and trade. At the Cologne Summit, we led a historic effort to enable the world's poorest and most heavily indebted countries to finance health, education, and opportunity programs. The Congress fails to fund the U.S. contribution. The bill also severely underfunds Multilateral Development Banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from our request. This will virtually double U.S. arrears to these banks and seriously undermine our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. These markets are critical to American jobs and opportunities.

Across the board, my Administration requested the funding necessary to assure American leadership on matters vital to the interests and values of our citizens. In area after area, from fighting terrorism and international crime to promoting nuclear stability on the Korean peninsula, from helping refugees and disaster victims to meetings its own goal of a 10,000-member Peace Corps, the Congress has failed to fund adequately these requests.

Several policy matters addressed in the bill are also problematic. One provision would hamper the Export-Import Bank's ability to be responsive to American exporters by requiring that

the Congress be notified of dozens of additional kinds of transactions before the Bank can offer financing. Another provision would allow the Export-Import Bank to operate without a quorum until March 2000. I have nominated two individuals to the Bank's Board, and they should be confirmed.

A third provision could be read to prevent the United States from engaging in diplomatic efforts to promote a cost-effective, global solution to climate change. A fourth provision places restrictions on assistance to Indonesia that could harm our ability to influence the objectives we share with the Congress: ensuring that Indonesia honors the referendum in East Timor and that security is restored there, while encouraging democracy and economic reform in Indonesia. Finally, this bill contains several sections that, if treated as mandatory, would encroach on the President's sole constitutional authority to conduct diplomatic negotiations.

In sum, this appropriations bill undermines important American interests and ignores the lessons that have been at the core of our bipartisan foreign policy for the last half century. Like the Senate's recent vote to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this bill reflects an inexcusable and potentially dangerous complacency about the opportunities and risks America faces in the world today. I therefore am returning this bill without my approval.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, one that maintains our commitment to protecting the Social Security surplus, properly addressing our shared goal of an America that is strong at home and strong abroad, respected not only for our leadership, but for the vision and commitment that real leadership entails. The American people deserve a foreign policy worthy of our great country, and I will fight to ensure that they continue to have one.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1999.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half hour to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to the bill, H.R. 2606, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleagues just heard, the President today vetoed the, I think, very responsible piece of legislation that the House and Senate and conferees worked on for some 6 or 7 months. The bill, I think, was a responsible bill that funded foreign aid at the \$12.7 billion level, but did not do so at the expense of any Social Security monies. Basically, Mr. Speaker, it was a freeze at last year's funding levels, and I am amazed that the President now says he cannot live on what we gave him last year and that he wants a 30 or 40 percent increase.

I understand in reading his veto message that he wants about \$4 billion more, but what the President does not say, even though he mentions Social Security in his veto message, is where are we going to get the money. So if we do not want to take it out of Social Security, which I am not going to agree to on any bill that I handle, we have other options.

We can increase taxes, which I am not going to have anything to do with either, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to burden the American taxpayers with additional money to help satisfy this insatiable appetite to give away our money that the President has. And, we are not going to take it out of Defense, Mr. Speaker. I know that some have suggested that that might be a way we could do it, but already our Defense budget is suffering, and we cannot afford to reduce our military moneys, because if we are going to comply with every request that the Department of State and the President makes with requests for foreign assistance in every Nation in the world, such as we witnessed in Kosovo, such as we witnessed in many other areas of the world, such as we are now facing in Indonesia, I think it would be a serious mistake to curtail the ability of the national defense, our military, by taking the money away from them.

So what the President does not tell us in his message is he is not suggesting what we do, other than to increase taxes, which we are not going to do. So maybe we are at an impasse.

But let me tell my colleagues something about the bill that the President just vetoed. One of the most popular provisions that I have ever seen since I have been in Congress with respect to the foreign assistance is the child survival account. We increased the child survival account over \$70 million this year over the President's request; and yet, he says no, that we ought to maybe take some of the money out of child survival.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues that the American people, while they do not have an appetite to give away their money that they are sending to us to foreign countries to be squandered away, such as reports that have come back about Russia have said have been done, but they do in fact support our efforts to provide food, to provide medical assistance, to provide educational opportunities for those children who live in nations which cannot afford to provide them with this.

So, they encourage this. Dozens of letters, hundreds of letters, thousands of communications have come to my office supporting the child survival account, supporting this type of foreign assistance. The American people support this. So what the President is suggesting is that we cut back maybe on child survival, and we are not going to do that. So he has left me no alternatives.

The President, in his original message, for example, suggested that we cut Israel by \$30 million. We said no, we are not going to do that, that Israel has been an ally of the United States, that we want peace in the Middle East. There was some question about the Wye monies. The President went out to the Wye Plantation, when those efforts were beginning to fall to pieces, and it looked like that the Palestinians and the Israelis were going to walk out of there without some agreement, and it is my understanding that he volunteered to just give them \$2 billion. Look, we will help you. We will give you \$2 billion.

So he goes out there, and then he comes back and he says, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I do not consider that an obligation. When the President goes to one of these meetings and raises his glass of wine and toasts these leaders and tells them, I will give you \$2 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund, we are not going to stand for that. But that is exactly what he said.

In speaking with Mr. Netanyahu right after that meeting, Mr. Netanyahu told me he did not ask for the money, that the money was volunteered. Well, maybe that is good foreign policy, but I do not think that it is.

One thing I think is good foreign policy is for the Congress not to get too involved in dictating to the administration what they are going to do and where they spend the money. For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, I have worked, argued with Members of this body about earmarking monies, about policy in the bill, trying to give this administration the flexibility and the latitude that they need to have an effective foreign policy. So I have tried my darnedest to give the President all of the room that he needs to maneuver, to adjust, to reprogram, to do whatever with the \$12.7 billion, for example, that we recommended be appropriated this year.

Now, all of a sudden, the President says, I do not care whether or not you

are helping me with policy; I do not care whether or not you have taken out all of those obnoxious earmarks; I do not care that you have not hamstrung the administration and Mrs. Albright into trying to go to a foreign country and do the will of 435 Members of Congress. We get no appreciation for that.

The President said there has been a lack of communication. I read in the newspapers this morning where one of his complaints about the whole appropriations process is that there is no communication. But I called the President. I called him, Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago; and I said, Mr. President, this is the same amount of money we gave you last year, and just like every other area of government, you are going to have to live with what we gave you last year. We are not going to increase it. And I talked to the President and I told him about the policy omissions that were not in there which would hamstring his administration; and I promise my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I think I had the President convinced that this was a good bill and that he might sign it.

But, he said, let me talk to my principals, which I assume that he meant Sandy Berger, who is one of his aides, and Madeleine Albright, who is Secretary of State. And I said, well, I will tell you what, Mr. President. That is all right with me. But before you talk with them about this issue that I have just explained to you, let me come over there and tell them what I have just told you. And he says, that is a good idea, Sonny. Let me call you back.

Well, the President never called back. Sandy Berger called me out of a restaurant about 9:30 at night the next night and said, the President asked me to call you and tell you that he reluctantly says he is going to have to veto your bill. You see, they did not want me in the same room with Sandy Berger and Madeleine Albright. They did not want me in the room with the President putting forth the same arguments that I am telling you about today. Instead, they wanted to tell the President well, this might have a political advantage. Do not worry about this; we will get more money. All we have to do is back old CALLAHAN down.

□ 1745

Well maybe that is good strategy, but the President cannot say to anybody that I have refused to communicate with him and work with him when I did every single thing that Jack Lew, one of his other assistants, wrote me and told me to do with respect to policy.

The only issue he has is that this is not enough money. Well, I am sorry, Mr. President. Tell me where to get it, but do not come up with this same old nonsense about you are going to raise taxes to do it; you are going to raise fees to do it; you are going to take it out of the national defense or you are going to take it out of Social Security,

because I am not going to have any part of that. So we are at a stalemate.

Now here we are having to start all over because we do not have the votes to override the President's veto. It has turned into a partisan issue. Whereas most every Democrat, when the bill initially passed the House, voted for it, now they say that the policy provisions are insufficient; they want \$2 billion, \$4 billion more money. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where we are going to get it.

I have thought about some strategy of my own. I mentioned when the bill was passed and we sent it to the President for his signature that every time somebody walks in the White House with a turban on his head that the President gets a glass of wine, gives it to the king or whoever he is talking to, then they stand there in the Oval Office or wherever they stand in the White House and they clink those glasses together and lo and behold the President says, "Let me give you a little bit of money."

So the president or king or whoever he is, walks out and he goes back to his country and he says, "The President promised me some money," and then the President calls up here and says, "Sonny, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I made this commitment to this king, to this president." And that is not right. That is not an obligation of the United States of America.

In fact, I think I am going to call the President, and I am going to go down to the White House one day this week. But before I go, I am going to buy me one of those turbans. And I am going to walk in the Oval Office with that turban on my head. And I am going to suggest to the President that we each get a glass of wine, and I am going to tell him that I am representing the senior citizens of this country, that I am representing the taxpayers of this country, and that I am representing the people who are concerned about Social Security, and let us have a toast. Let us toast that we are not going to take this \$4 billion off the backs of the senior citizens or off of our national defense and we are not going to raise taxes.

Then the President can come over here and say, "Well, we have an obligation. I made a toast, and therefore you Congress people are obligated not to raid Social Security, not to increase taxes, not to take money out of Social Security."

So maybe I will try that strategy of going to the White House with a turban on my head and suggesting to the President that we, indeed, ought to keep this \$12.7 billion where it is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman very diplomatically said he does not know where the President is planning to come up with this money, but it is

true, it is reality, we do not have to kid ourselves, he is talking about transferring money out of the Social Security trust fund.

It is going to be real hard for me to go home and tell my grandmother that, "You know what, today you are going to have a little bit less money in your trust fund because the President wants to send it to foreigners." I can envision the conversation.

"Oh, you mean Americans who live in foreign countries who paid into Social Security?"

"No, ma'am."

"What do you mean going overseas with my Social Security money?"

"Well, the President wants to send it to India and Pakistan and Russia and North Korea, and all of these kinds of places, grandmother. What do you think about that?" And she is going to be horrified.

The reality is, we need not kid ourselves, what the President of the United States said today to America's seniors, we want to get the money out of the Social Security trust fund and send it overseas to foreign governments and many governments who are not always friendly to the United States, and that is a direct affront to American taxpayers.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It is an affront to me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting to see what is going to be going on in the heat that will be turned up in this cool fall in Washington, D.C. The President is vetoing bills because they do not spend enough. There is simply no other explanation for his action. He wants more money. Some had said he wanted \$2 billion, he wanted \$4 billion more.

According to the White House, the President is vetoing this bill because he thinks there is not enough spending in it. According to the White House, \$12.6 billion is not enough money; but if this is not enough, I only have one simple question: Where does the President think more money will come from?

Day after day, the President walks up to the television cameras and says that tough choices need to be made, but then all he suggests is skyrocketing spending increases. That is not a tough choice. That is the easy way out.

Times have changed here in Washington. Even the President claimed not so long ago that the era of big government was over. If this is true, the tough budget decisions that need to be made must be to restrain spending, not increase it. Money does not just fall from the trees. It is not the President's money.

There are only two ways to maintain a balanced budget, three ways actually, and pay for the President's big government spending increases. He can either raise taxes, and I can say unequivocally

this House is not going to raise taxes for more government spending. The President can raid Social Security surpluses. We are not going to do that. Even the President says he does not want to do that. There is only one other way he could get more spending increases, and that is to find cuts in other parts of the budget.

Frankly, if the leadership goes down to the White House tomorrow I think the message is going to be, "Mr. President, we are not spending one dime of the Social Security surplus. Mr. President, we are not going to raise taxes for more government spending. Mr. President, if you want more spending, then tell us how to pay for it. Where are you going to cut it from? Where are you going to move money around? How are you going to pay for it?"

All he said in his veto message was there is just not enough spending. He wants more spending.

Now, the President vetoed this bill and he said that he wants a whopping 30 percent increase in foreign aid. Make no mistake about it, every dime of this increase, without offsets and cuts in other spending come directly out of the Social Security surplus.

I think this is so shortsighted. Raiding tomorrow's generations to cover the excesses of today robs America of its future. The Republican budget plan is committed to balancing the budget without raiding Social Security or raising taxes to do it, and we can say it over and over until we turn blue in the face. The President says we are already into the Social Security surplus. That is another Clintonism, Mr. Speaker. We are not into the Social Security surplus.

They get a CBO letter that uses false assumptions that we are not doing, and they wave the letter around saying we are spending the Social Security surplus. We are not there. This House is not going to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the budget will not balance itself. We in Congress are working very hard and making the responsible decisions for the future of America. All they are doing at the White House is throwing mud and hopes it sticks.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just borrowed the Constitution from the parliamentarian. I did not really need it because I am sure everyone in this room has memorized the preamble to it. "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

All of those goals stated in the preamble to the Constitution about insuring the safety of our country and the security of it and its future for our children are undermined by this foreign operations bill, and I salute President Clinton for his veto.

Although the Clerk has already read the veto message in its entirety, I want to call some specifics to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this foreign operations bill undermines the goals of our preamble to the constitution. President Clinton said it so well in his veto statement when he said, "The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel danger, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world."

"This bill rejects all of those principles."

"It implies that we are too small and too insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and our prosperity."

The President goes on to say that, "By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition," and an expensive one, I might add.

"The overall funding provided in this bill is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan," which this Congress supported; half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan.

There are many concerns that I will just briefly address about it, that the President mentions. He mentions that, "This bill would provide neither the \$800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation," for the Wye River agreement, "nor the \$500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River agreement."

"Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process."

In addition, the bill is short in funding for economic support to the multilateral development banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from the President's request. This would virtually double the arrears. We are trying to have debt forgiveness. We are trying to go into the next century, the next millennium, giving these countries a chance, working with them, cooperating with them.

This is not about a handout. This is about a hand-up, and it is something that our country says that we profess.

It will cost us less in the end if we can obtain markets for our products and promote peace and Democratic institutions in these countries. Ridding them of their debt will help do that. This bill also seriously undermines our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. If for no other reason, if we have no pragmatic sense or practical sense about what this means to us as a country, we do know that these markets, when developed, are critical to American jobs and opportunities. That is so much for what the President had said.

I would like to now talk about what Mr. HASTERT said.

□ 1800

The Speaker, in criticizing the President's veto, made these comments. He called this a responsible foreign aid package that funded our Nation's foreign aid programs at last year's level. Wrong. Wrong. Wrong. No matter how many times our colleagues on this floor in the majority say that this bill is funded at last year's level, it is not.

Our spending last year, when we combine the bill with our supplemental, and the supplemental does not include Kosovo and the Hurricane Mitch supplemental, we are below last year's funding significantly. But then the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) goes on to say that we want to take Social Security money and give this money to foreign nations, and he does it in a very offhand way. He says the Republicans will play no part in this scheme. The Congress will not use Social Security as a pot of gold to fund foreign aid.

This is such an act of desperation. I feel so sorry for this pathetic initiative that is being taken by my colleagues. They have all the big guns rolled out: The Speaker's statement. The whip spoke before I even had a chance to put our statement on the RECORD, and that was fine. I see the distinguished Majority Leader here, and of course the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, coming all out full force to make this statement.

This is an act of desperation by a majority party that does not have a case to take to the American people. The economy domestically is doing great. Unemployment is down. The stock market is up. Inflation is practically negligible, and they have to go find an issue and, how convenient, one with the neoisolationism of their caucus giving them impetus to do this.

This is a very sad day because, frankly, the arguments that my colleagues make about this argue to eliminate all the funding in the bill completely. Why have any foreign aid if this is such a bad idea as we review it?

Mr. Speaker, others will, and I do not have time right now to go into the illusion that my colleagues are trying to

present about their not spending Social Security and other aspects of these spending bills. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will go into that and, if I have time, I will later.

But I want to reiterate that this bill is \$12.7 billion. Last year, the bill and the supplemental that went with it were \$1.1 billion higher. Let us not play a shell game. Let us be honest with the American people about what we are spending, and let us not have a \$1.1 billion cut from last year, again not including the Kosovo supplemental or the supplemental on Hurricane Mitch. Let us not have a \$1.1 billion cut, which we call a freeze.

In conclusion, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart. This is the total budget of the United States, \$1.739 trillion. The foreign aid, as a percentage of the total budget of the United States, is less than 1 percent. In fact, it is .68 percent. With the President's request, it will be brought up to about 8 percent. It is less than 1 percent.

Within that 1 percent is the Export-Import Bank, which finances our exports overseas, creating jobs in the U.S., OPIC, Trade Development Administration, all of those initiatives that promote U.S. trade which have nothing to do with bilateral and multilateral assistance to any other country except the United States. It is all in our national interest. It is less than 1 percent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he shall consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his hard work on this legislative effort. First thing I would observe is the American people are a generous people. We are a kind people. We are a people that have always been willing to sacrifice of our own treasury, of our own resources, indeed of our own lives and our own peace to help the rest of the world obtain peace, safety, and security, and above all freedom. That has not changed.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) points out that our foreign aid budget has decreased as a percentage of the overall American Federal Government's budget over the years, and that is true.

Why has it decreased as a percentage of the overall budget? Not because we Americans have reduced our willingness or, in fact, our contribution to the rest of the world. Indeed, it still is exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world. But because the burdens and the responsibilities that our Government carries within our own country for our own people has grown.

It has grown in Medicare. It has grown in Social Security. It has grown



in Medicaid. It has grown in education. It has grown in defense. It has grown in the environmental concerns we express for this country, and any number of different ways our Government's budget keeps growing. With all of that growth, we maintain a commitment to the rest of the world that is still exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world.

So in that regard, again, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his dedication and his commitment.

Now, yesterday, put all this within the context of where we are today, we had both good news and bad news from the White House. I have to tell my colleagues I was pleased, I was enthusiastic, I was excited when I watched TV yesterday and saw the President's chief of staff, John Podesta, say, "The President of the United States today shares the commitment that the Republicans in Congress have been fighting for to complete this budget without touching a dime's worth of Social Security for any other purpose."

This is a historic change in the manner in which we use the taxpayers' money. For 30 years, the Federal Government has taken Americans' Social Security taxes and spent them on other purposes. Last year, for the first time ever, in all those 30 years, that did not happen. Last year, no dime of Social Security was used for some purpose other than Social Security.

We are trying to write a budget for next year that stays the same. This will not happen. It is time to stop the raid. So as we do that, we have to look at every manner in which the Federal Government might spend one's money and say, how can we pare back? Where can we make reductions? How can we engage in trade-offs, accept and set priorities and keep us within this one fundamental limit that we will not complete the budget for fiscal year 2000 with any money that spends Social Security taxes on any purpose other than Social Security?

That I take as a point of honor, a point of duty, a point of duty to two great generations, my parents and my children; my parents who are living off Social Security benefits today and my children who are paying the taxes so that that money is available for that purpose.

Now, the President has said we share with the House and the Senate this commitment. That was good news. We have waited a long time, Mr. President, for you to make this commitment to preserve Social Security. We were all startled. We were all disappointed when, in your own budget, you propose that 40 percent of the Social Security revenues be spent for something else. But now you have said, "I agree with the Congress." I was heartened when I heard that.

I am delighted to go to the White House tomorrow at the President's invitation to discuss with the President of the United States how will we do

this, complete this budget without spending a dime's worth of Social Security for any purpose other than Social Security. I am excited for this opportunity.

That was the good news. Now comes the bad news.

Within hours of this revelation from the White House, the President vetoes the foreign aid bill because he wants \$4 billion more for foreign aid. We are left to ask, Mr. President, where will you get the money? We cannot take it from Social Security. You have expressed your commitment to not do so. Do you want to take it from education? You think that is a high priority, too. Should we take it from defense? We have got soldiers and sailors, men and women in our uniforms today, ill-equipped ill-prepared, ill-trained, and, frankly, ill-humored. Morale is a deterioration of readiness that this Nation can ill-afford.

Where would you take the money, the 4 billion additional dollars, Mr. President? We will work with you on the commitment. We will not take it from Social Security, nor will we deny any other domestic American priority that is equal or greater than foreign aid. That is our commitment. We look forward to working with you.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, a gentleman who served 10 years as the chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what a phony debate that I have heard here today. We hear our friends on the majority side of the aisle saying that somehow because the President wants us to meet some of our additional obligations overseas and because our President wants to have a well-rounded defense of our national interest overseas, that somehow he is spending more than our friends on the majority side want, and, therefore, is guilty of all kinds of fiscal sins.

I would point out it was not the President who added \$16 billion to Pentagon spending for items that the Pentagon did not even ask for and then declared \$6 billion of them emergencies so that they could pretend that that money was not being spent under the budget rules. It was not the White House that did that. It was our friends in the majority party.

Overall, they spent almost \$16 billion more than the President asked for in the supplemental in the regular Pentagon appropriation bill. It was not the President who added \$1.3 billion for a

whole new ship the Navy did not want. It was our friends on the majority side because it was going to be built in the district of the Majority Leader in the other body, in Pascagoula, Mississippi. The President did not ask to spend that money, that pork.

The argument that we are hearing from the majority side comes from a party that has demonstrated time and time again its refusal to support our national interest in a well-rounded fashion around the world.

We hear this same argument from people who do not want us to pay our bills at the United Nations, even though we risk losing our vote because of that. We hear it from the same people who are refusing to provide the funding to meet the promises that we had already made in the Middle East with respect to the Wye agreement.

I saw one Republican leader stand in the White House and tell the President standing 6 feet away from him that the President had absolutely no right to engage in military action against Serbia because it was a sovereign country. Then after the President reached a successful conclusion of that conflict, I saw that same Republican leader go to the press and denounce the President because he had agreed to a solution that allowed Mr. Milosevic to stay in power. What hypocrisy. How do my colleagues expect we remove Mr. Milosevic, through emaculate conception? It takes military action.

This is the same party that last week, in what I believe to be the most irresponsible action by this Congress in 25 years, it is the same party that ripped up the test ban treaty. Now, to understand why that treaty is important, we have to understand why it is linked to the nonproliferation treaty.

The United States, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has tried to convince the nonnuclear powers of this world not to achieve nuclear weapons status because it destabilizes the world. So we have tried to set a good example for them. We have said to them, Okay, if you do not develop your nuclear weapons, we will not test ours. Yet, last week, we saw the United States Senate majority party blow away any chance we have to exercise moral leadership on the issue of nuclear test ban treaties.

□ 1815

They say, oh, we do not know for sure that we will be 100 percent effective in detecting other people's tests. Well, we were going to be a whole lot more effective than we are right now, because that treaty would have allowed us to place sensors all around the world to detect all but the smallest nuclear explosions. But, no, they had to try to administer another political defeat to the President by defeating the nuclear test ban treaty.

So this is a party which has walked away from its responsibilities time and time again in the international arena, and now they try to pretend that they

are doing it all in the name of fiscal responsibility and because they want to save Social Security.

Are they kidding? Give me a break. The Republican Party is now the great savior of Social Security? The same party that tried to kill that program in the crib before it was ever created? The same party that has tried to turn Social Security over to the insurance industry for 30 years? They want to privatize it to death. The same party that wanted to take billions of dollars out of Medicare in order to pay for a big capital gains tax cut for their buddies? This is the party that we are now supposed to rely upon to save Social Security?

All I can say, if that is a record that demonstrates their support of Social Security, God save Social Security.

So what are they doing? What all of this is is a giant scam. Our friends in the majority party for the last year have tried to push a tax package through this House which would give 70 percent of the benefits to people who make over 100,000 bucks a year, and they took it home and they tried to sell it over the August break. And what did they find? They found that their constituents did not buy it. And what they found is that they had dropped 12 points to 16 points in the public opinion polls with seniors. So now what we have going on on this floor is operation crawl-back. And what it is, it is an effort to crawl back to another political position in order to try to win a few points back from senior citizens. It ain't gonna work, fellas. It ain't gonna work.

What is really going on here, the party that claims it is for fiscal responsibility has produced a budget this year which has more than \$40 billion in gimmicks in order to pretend that they are staying within the budget ceilings and in order to pretend that they are not spending a dime in Social Security when, in fact, their own actions have already spent more than \$23 billion of the Social Security surplus for other purposes this year.

Now, I just have to say, when they have over \$40 billion in budget gimmicks, when they have already spent over \$23 billion in Social Security, when they have engaged in a gimmick called advanced appropriations, which means they will move the money from this year into next year to hide the fact that they are actually spending it and committing it this year, when those advanced appropriations go from \$4 billion to \$27 billion, and then they come here and object because the President wants us to pay our U.N. bills, because the President wants us to meet our obligations to the Wye Accords to promote peace in the Middle East, pardon me if I do not take that with a straight face. Pardon me if I think there is just a little bit missing here.

When we put all the baloney aside on Social Security, what are the facts? The facts are that every year from 1983

until 1997 this Congress spent every dime that we generated in Social Security surpluses for other purposes and put IOUs in the treasury in order to recognize that fact. In 1997, we spent 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, as the Congress had for years, on other items. But starting last year, starting 2 years ago, I should say, that has been turned around. Two years ago, for the first time, we spent less than one-third of the Social Security surplus on other purposes, and we paid down debt by \$60 billion. This last year that just came to a close, we paid down debt by over \$100 billion.

When all of the baloney is over, whether the Republican Party wins the argument or whether the Democratic Party wins the argument, in the end this coming year we will pay down debt by another \$100 billion. Only the people running this House could turn that kind of a major policy victory into a crisis.

It seems to me if we want to be honest with the people of the United States, we will tell them that this action in paying down debt over the last 2½ years has done more to strengthen Social Security than anything that we did for Social Security since the Green-span Commission saved it with congressional votes. That is the honest truth.

But, no, instead, we are going to see this partisan slugfest on Social Security. Well, I have to tell my colleagues that it is not going to fool anybody. It certainly is not going to fool people in the House. They may fool themselves, that would be nothing new, but I would urge my colleagues, in the end, to remember we have an obligation to meet our domestic responsibilities and our international responsibilities in a balanced manner. It would be nice, for once, if we could see that coming out of the Republican leadership in this House.

I do not see it today, but I am going to go home tonight and pray again, and maybe some day we will.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time now remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, my good friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this poses, for me, a very puzzling situation. I have so much respect for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I know that they have worked actively on behalf of all of us in the House of Representatives and this Nation in trying to provide for a stable,

prosperous, and democratic world through foreign operations. But I put to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), that when he cites the fact that the amount of money that is offered this year is the same as last year, events that have happened over the course of the year causes us to have to take a different view.

While the gentleman and I may disagree and have ideological perspectives that are different, the fact of the matter is that the Wye Accords are important to all of us. And we did, whether the gentleman agrees that the President had that responsibility or not, we agreed to \$800 million that we would provide; and we have not in this year's budget.

Now, I do not know how that plays out. I cannot argue with appropriators and those of my colleagues that know the inner workings of the budget better than do I with reference to who is at fault about what having to do with Social Security. But I know cuts when I see them: \$212 million cut from economic recovery and democratization in Africa, Latin America and Asia in this budget; \$44 million cut from disaster assistance; \$53 million cut from refugee assistance; \$35 million cut from the Peace Corps; \$17 million cut from the NAD Bank Community Adjustment; \$178 million cut from IDA lending to the poorest countries; \$87 million from debt relief; \$107 million cut from global environment facilities; \$53 million from the Inter-American Bank; \$80 million, 10 percent, for promotion of U.S. exports, which helps American, American, businesspersons.

What we need to know is that foreign aid is not a giveaway; foreign aid shows the way. And we cannot proceed along these lines in this great country and be looked to for the direction, as we are by countries all over the world, if we intend to provide a stable, prosperous and democratic world.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, to explain the real story of who is utilizing Social Security monies.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the question of Social Security is one that is important to all of us, especially those of us who have many people in their districts receiving Social Security checks.

I would just like to show this graph that is based on figures developed by the Congressional Budget Office. This graph shows that the money that was taken from Social Security under the Democrats in the Congress rose dramatically. The Republicans took over at this line, and we can see what happened. The number went way down, and for fiscal year 2000 it is going to be zero.

It is our determination, and that is one reason this bill does not spend as much money on foreign aid as the President wants, we are determined

not to take any money out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and we are determined that any spending requests that go over the budget surplus will be offset. It is a pretty simple plan.

But by doing this, we are going to maintain the balanced budget that we fought for years to get and finally achieved. We are going to preserve that balanced budget, and we are going to stop paying billions and billions and billions of dollars as interest payment on the national debt when we could use that money in more places than that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion because we now have a chance to reconsider this year's foreign aid bill which was plagued by low funding levels from the start and never really recovered. Now we are faced again with a very important choice. We can insist upon a dangerously underfunded foreign aid bill, jeopardizing not only the United States' leadership around the world but also our national security; or we can work to rectify some of the most egregious funding cuts to our initiatives abroad, maintaining the United States of America's international stature, and acting in the best interests of our own national security.

We really have no choice, in my judgment. This bill, as it stands now, will severely erode our ability to pursue our interests abroad. And our stinginess now will be an expensive mistake. Saving now but paying double and triple later is no way to protect the global interests of the American people. It is just plain irresponsible.

While the majority engages in political brinkmanship, we are already feeling the effects of turning our back on what has historically been a cornerstone of United States foreign policy. Funding for implementation of the Wye River agreement is essential. And each day we drag our feet, we jeopardize Israel's security; we endanger the very security of Middle East peace; and we destroy our own credibility as a mediator in the Middle East peace process. Wye assistance has become a pawn in the majority's budget game, a dangerous game with very high stakes indeed.

And Wye is not the only problem with this bill. The International Development Association, the Peace Corps, debt relief, international organizations and programs are all underfunded. The bill remains \$2 billion below the President's request and \$1 billion below last year's level.

This is not the first and it is not the only example of a reckless decision on the part of the majority that shows utter disregard for maintaining the United States' global stature. Last week, the Senate majority brazenly de-

feated the comprehensive test ban treaty. The United States is currently the U.N.'s biggest deadbeat, owing over \$1 billion in arrears.

Thanks to the President's decision to veto the foreign aid bill we sent him, we can now, working together, begin to restore the United States' diminished global leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. Stop the games, stop the gimmickry now, and let us go back to work and return with a bill that preserves our national security.

□ 1830

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in this century we have had the New Deal, starting with F.D.R. We have had the fair deal. We have had the square deal. But this could be called the "misdeal" because it is a raw deal for America's seniors. Congress ought to say "no deal" to the President.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity to visit with a farmer in Kimball, South Dakota. He has been a farmer for 37 years, and he is hoping some day to be able to cash rent his farm ground out, which is not worth a whole lot right now, and that, coupled with his Social Security payment, retire.

What the President has said is that we are going to take from this farmer's account the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for more foreign aid because \$12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough, \$12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough. The American people ought to be outraged.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of South Dakota seniors, I say "no deal" to the President's bad policy in this respect.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I rise in opposition to H.R. 2606, the conference report on foreign operations appropriations. This moves us in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, the conference report moves us into a dangerously low budget.

We have the conference agreement, which provides \$12.6 billion. It is nearly \$2 billion below the President's request and \$1 billion less than last year's bill.

The low level of funding is untenable. It will be impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the world's community with an inadequate foreign affairs budget. Nearly every major account in the conference report is underfunded. And one specific initiative, the Africa accounts, are nonexistent.

The omission is particularly troubling, as it signals a lack of support for

the recent strides made by countries in Africa. The development fund for Africa is being cut 40 percent from last year.

\$175 million is cut from essential loans for the poorest countries. \$155 million is cut from global environmental protection programs. \$87 million is denied for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries in the world. \$50 million is cut from African development loans. \$200 million is cut from economic development and democratic building in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. \$35 million is denied for the Peace Corps, where we just agreed to move our numbers up to 10,000 volunteers. Many Members from both sides of the aisle said it was great. So what do we do? We approve 10,000 and cut 35 million.

The gentleman talked about \$12 billion, how outraged people from South Dakota were. I think I am in a time capsule where we are back 200 years ago. I never heard such an egregious, outrageous statement.

Here we are going to give \$782 billion back to the wealthiest people in this country, and we are talking about cutting \$2 billion back from the poorest people in the world and that people in this country are outraged.

I think we live in a society that some people are really very, very narrow visioned; and I believe that we must regain our position in the world. I think that the President is absolutely right. I stand a hundred percent behind his veto.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for yielding me the time. And I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). Because instead of categorizing this with a unique historical perspective that is revisionist, to say the least, let us engage in some recent history.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States came here about 10 months ago, and in his message to a joint session of Congress, in his State of the Union address, he said it was up to us to save Social Security first. But with his veto today, the President is telling all Americans, Mr. Speaker, that they should surrender a portion of their Social Security Trust Fund to go not for their retirement but to a scheme of bigger spending not on Americans but on other folks around the world.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I just got on the House floor. Is it correct that the President vetoed this bill because it takes Americans' hard-earned money and he wants to give billions away to other countries more?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is exactly the

case. The President is taking the hard-earned money of Americans and wanting to spend more and more and more and jeopardize the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has vetoed a foreign aid bill because it does not send enough American tax dollars overseas. Outrageous.

In order to satisfy the President's insatiable appetite for foreign aid, Congress would have to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. That would be unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, let us protect Social Security for those who receive benefits now and those who pay the taxes and those who want to receive benefits in the future. Let us stop the foreign aid raid.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has said no to the President's taking money from our farmers in North Carolina who have lost their homes, small businesses.

The President has said, no, our farmers do not matter. He does not mind, and they do not matter. That is what he said. But the committee of the gentleman has said, our farmers and our seniors matter. I thank the gentleman very much for saying yes to our people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the last two comments, the facts are they have already spent \$23 billion of the Social Security surplus in bills that they have already passed in the House this year. That is the fact even if they do not want to admit it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 3½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, well, this year trick or treat for UNICEF will have a new meaning because the President just said no to a \$9 million increase in UNICEF funding. So the children of America are going to have to work a little bit harder.

It is important because the President also said no to a \$60 million increase in child survival programs. He also, to keep the streets just as dangerous as he could, said no to a \$24 million increase in the international drug programs.

We keep hearing about our obligations overseas and our promises to the Middle East. I was in Israel. I spoke to Mr. Barak in a small group at a Con-

gressional delegation in Israel and Jerusalem and also here in the Capitol. I also went to Jordan and spoke to King Abdallah. There was no discussion of you-all made this promise the Wye River is in the bag, we are spending the money. I did not hear that from the two top leaders of these countries.

But I do see that, in this bill, the President said no to our increasing aid to Israel \$30 million where he had cut it.

We keep talking about what this money is going to do. It is going to go to good causes overseas, but any increase will come straight out of Social Security. We should reject this veto.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since my speaker has not returned to the floor, I will use his time and my time in closing. It affords me the luxury of commending my distinguished chairman for the work that we did together to bring this bill to the floor originally. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill but only with the idea that when we came back from conference, it could only be supported if there was a higher allocation to this foreign operations bill.

So it is not with a criticism of the process with which the distinguished chairman moved the bill through. We worked together on that. What it is a criticism of is the lack of funding in the bill for us to live up to our leadership role in the world.

The distinguished majority leader said that the percentage of funding for foreign aid is going down because other spending is going up, he said in reference to my remarks. I did not say that. I said that, in real dollars, our foreign aid spending is being reduced since Reagan's years by, what, one-quarter to one-half in real dollars, not in percentages.

This debate about Social Security that our colleagues have drummed up really does a disservice to the whole debate on the budget and the appropriations process. This debate that our colleagues have drummed up, this illusion that they have tried to convey on the floor today is an insult to the intelligence of the Social Security recipients, to the Social Security donors, and their families.

Yes, President Clinton said he was going to save Social Security first, and we all subscribed to that. That is not the only thing we do. Now, if the gentleman thinks that is the only thing we do, maybe we should have a zero foreign operations budget. Maybe we should spend no money on any trade assistance for the Ex-Im Bank for us to promote U.S. products abroad or the Trade Development Administration for the same purpose or OPIC, which enables our products to find markets abroad. Maybe we should do none of that.

Maybe we should abandon everything we do with the religious community to reach out to poor children throughout the world and to help them stave off disease and starvation.

What is in this bill, as I said earlier, is 6.3 percent of a percentage, less than 1 percent, of the Federal budget. With President Clinton's funds, it would be .8 percent. So it would be still less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, a small percentage and a small price to pay for what the President enumerated in his veto message about promoting democracies and free economies throughout the world, about promoting markets for our products, about honoring our commitments internationally, about living up to our leadership role in the world.

This century that we are coming to an end as we do fiscal year 2000 appropriations bills is a terrible century in many respects. Nazism, communism, authoritarianism were rampant throughout this century and they are coming to an end now.

One of the brightest stars of this century was the founding of the State of Israel. How sad it is that this body, representing the American people who have fully supported that brave, courageous state all these 51 years of its existence, that we, coming to the end of this century, will not take yes for an answer in the peace process by funding the Wye River agreement.

Leaders in that region gave their lives, their health, and all of their future for this peace agreement; and we in this body are rejecting all of that sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's veto when the time comes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and echo what she said. We have worked in a nonpartisan fashion trying to give the President the flexibility, trying to give the President the sufficient amount of money to have effective foreign policy.

The President, in my opinion, has just thrown this agreement out the door when he vetoed this bill. I am going to send him a bill now that will instruct him on what foreign policy problems can be if indeed he is so obnoxious in vetoing a bill such as this.

So let me tell the President, this next bill he is going to get, number one, is not going to be any more and, number 2, is going to give him a reason to veto it. Because we are going to go back to the old days when the Democrats were indeed telling Ronald Reagan and George Bush what they were going to do during their foreign policy.

□ 1845

So if the President wants to declare war, this is war. It is war that he is going to suffer, not me. The people of Alabama could care less if I pass a foreign aid bill or not. So I am not going to suffer. But millions of children are going to suffer because they do not have the child survival money that we put into the bill.

Let me just give Members one example of what the President said, and I wish everybody in America could get a copy of this message from the President of the United States and understand what he is saying. One thing he says in here is I need \$900 million to forgive debt for poorer nations. That comes from his trip to Africa where he took 1,700 people with him and spent \$47 million of the American taxpayers' money and goes over there and once again clinks his glass and then comes back and says, This is an entitlement. We want to forgive this debt that these foreign leaders have incurred during these corrupt regimes in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, if people could see this message, if they could understand exactly what the President is saying, they would be up here marching on this Capitol saying, "SONNY, don't give in to that guy. He has this insatiable appetite to spend our money to give it to these foreign countries just because they walk in his front door."

I might forewarn the President that Halloween is just around the corner and a lot of these people knocking on the White House gate for trick-or-treat might have on turbans, and I might tell them when they go knock on the door, "Wear a turban and carry a bag and let me tell you, that President will fill it up. He'll give you an IOU from the Congress."

But we are not going to give in to the President on this issue. We might be here till Christmas, we might be here till Easter, but we are not going to give in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal, de novo;

H.R. 2140, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2886, by the yeas and nays; and House Concurrent Resolution 196, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

#### YEAS—357

Abercrombie	Deutsch	Kaptur
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Kasich
Aderholt	Dicks	Kelly
Allen	Dingell	Kennedy
Andrews	Dixon	Kildee
Archer	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Armey	Dooley	Kind (WI)
Bachus	Doolittle	King (NY)
Baker	Doyle	Kingston
Baldacci	Dreier	Klecza
Baldwin	Duncan	Kolbe
Ballenger	Dunn	Kuykendall
Barcia	Edwards	LaFalce
Barr	Ehlers	LaHood
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	Lampson
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	Lantos
Bartlett	Engel	Largent
Barton	Eshoo	Larson
Bass	Etheridge	Latham
Bateman	Everett	LaTourette
Becerra	Ewing	Lazio
Bentsen	Fletcher	Leach
Bereuter	Foley	Lee
Berkley	Forbes	Levin
Berman	Ford	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Biggert	Fowler	Linder
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Lofgren
Bishop	Frost	Lowey
Blagojevich	Galleghy	Lucas (KY)
Bliley	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Blumenauer	Gejdenson	Luther
Blunt	Gekas	Maloney (CT)
Boehlert	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Boehner	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Bonilla	Gillmor	Mascara
Bonior	Gilman	Matsui
Bono	Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)
Boswell	Goode	McCarthy (NY)
Boucher	Goodlatte	McCollum
Boyd	Goodling	McCrery
Brady (TX)	Gordon	McGovern
Brown (OH)	Goss	McHugh
Bryant	Graham	McInnis
Burr	Granger	McIntyre
Burton	Green (WI)	McKeon
Callahan	Greenwood	McKinney
Calvert	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Campbell	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Canady	Hansen	Metcalf
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Capps	Hayes	Millender
Capuano	Hayworth	McDonald
Cardin	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Castle	Herger	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Hill (IN)	Miller, George
Chambliss	Hinche	Minge
Chenoweth-Hage	Hinojosa	Mink
Clayton	Hobson	Moakley
Clement	Hoeffel	Mollohan
Coble	Hoekstra	Moore
Combest	Holden	Moran (VA)
Condit	Holt	Morella
Conyers	Hooley	Murtha
Cook	Horn	Myrick
Cox	Hostettler	Nadler
Coyne	Houghton	Napolitano
Cramer	Hoyer	Nethercutt
Crowley	Hulshof	Ney
Cubin	Hunter	Northup
Cummings	Hyde	Norwood
Cunningham	Inslee	Nussle
Danner	Isakson	Obey
Davis (FL)	Istook	Ortiz
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Ose
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Deal	(TX)	Oxley
DeGette	Jenkins	Packard
Delahunt	John	Paul
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pease
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Pelosi
DeMint	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)

Petri	Scott	Terry
Phelps	Sensenbrenner	Thomas
Pickering	Serrano	Thornberry
Pitts	Sessions	Thune
Pombo	Shadeegg	Thurman
Pomeroy	Shaw	Tiaht
Porter	Shays	Tierney
Portman	Sherman	Toomey
Price (NC)	Sherwood	Trafigant
Quinn	Shimkus	Turner
Radanovich	Shows	Udall (CO)
Rahall	Shuster	Upton
Rangel	Simpson	Vitter
Regula	Sisisky	Walden
Reyes	Skeen	Walsh
Reynolds	Skelton	Wamp
Riley	Slaughter	Waters
Rivers	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Rogan	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Rogers	Snyder	Weiner
Rohrabacher	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Rothman	Spratt	Wexler
Roukema	Stabenow	Weygand
Roybal-Allard	Stark	Whitfield
Royce	Stearns	Wicker
Ryan (WI)	Stenholm	Wilson
Ryun (KS)	Strickland	Wise
Salmon	Stump	Wolf
Sanchez	Sununu	Woolsey
Sanders	Talent	Wu
Sandlin	Tanner	Wynn
Sawyer	Tauscher	Young (AK)
Saxton	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	

#### NAYS—49

Baird	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Borski	Hill (MT)	Pickett
Brown (FL)	Hilleary	Ramstad
Clay	Hilliard	Sabo
Clyburn	Hutchinson	Schaffer
Coburn	Kucinich	Stupak
Costello	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Crane	Markey	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Dickey	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
English	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Evans	Moran (KS)	Velazquez
Filner	Oberstar	Vento
Gibbons	Olver	Visclosky
Green (TX)	Pascarell	Weller
Gutierrez	Pastor	
Gutknecht	Payne	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancred

#### NOT VOTING—26

Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Menendez
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Neal
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Carson	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Collins	Klink	Rush
Cooksey	Knollenberg	Sanford
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Fattah	Martinez	Towns
Frelinghuysen	McIntosh	

□ 1910

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2140, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2140, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 9, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

## YEAS—394

Abercrombie	Coyne	Greenwood
Ackerman	Cramer	Gutierrez
Aderholt	Crane	Gutknecht
Allen	Crowley	Hall (OH)
Andrews	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Archer	Cummings	Hansen
Armey	Cunningham	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Danner	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hayes
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hayworth
Baldacci	Davis (VA)	Hefley
Baldwin	Deal	Hill (IN)
Ballenger	DeFazio	Hill (MT)
Barcia	DeGette	Hilleary
Barr	Delahunt	Hilliard
Barrett (NE)	DeLauro	Hinchey
Barrett (WI)	DeLay	Hinojosa
Bartlett	DeMint	Hobson
Barton	Deutsch	Hoefel
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Bateman	Dickey	Holt
Becerra	Dicks	Hooley
Bentsen	Dingell	Horn
Bereuter	Dixon	Houghton
Berkley	Doggett	Hoyer
Berman	Dooley	Hulshof
Berry	Doolittle	Hunter
Biggert	Doyle	Hutchinson
Bilbray	Dreier	Hyde
Bilirakis	Duncan	Inslee
Bishop	Dunn	Isakson
Blagojevich	Edwards	Istook
Bliley	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Boehlert	Emerson	(TX)
Boehner	Engel	Jenkins
Bonilla	English	John
Bonior	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Bono	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Borski	Evans	Kanjorski
Boswell	Everett	Kaptur
Boucher	Ewing	Kasich
Boyd	Filner	Kelly
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	Foley	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Bryant	Ford	Kind (WI)
Burr	Fossella	King (NY)
Burton	Fowler	Kingston
Callahan	Frank (MA)	Klecza
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Campbell	Frost	Kucinich
Canady	Gallegly	Kuykendall
Cannon	Ganske	LaFalce
Capps	Gejdenson	LaHood
Capuano	Gekas	Lampson
Cardin	Gephardt	Lantos
Chabot	Gibbons	Largent
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Larson
Clay	Gillmor	Latham
Clayton	Gilman	LaTourette
Clement	Gonzalez	Lazio
Clyburn	Goode	Leach
Coble	Goodlatte	Lee
Coburn	Goodling	Levin
Combest	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Condit	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Conyers	Graham	Linder
Cook	Granger	Lipinski
Costello	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Cox	Green (WI)	Lofgren

Lowey	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Lucas (KY)	Petri	Spence
Lucas (OK)	Phelps	Spratt
Luther	Pickering	Stabenow
Maloney (CT)	Pickett	Stark
Maloney (NY)	Pitts	Stearns
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Markey	Porter	Strickland
Mascara	Portman	Stump
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stupak
McCarthy (MO)	Quinn	Sununu
McCarthy (NY)	Radanovich	Sweeney
McCollum	Rahall	Talent
McCrery	Ramstad	Tancredo
McDermott	Rangel	Tanner
McGovern	Regula	Tauscher
McHugh	Reyes	Tauzin
McInnis	Reynolds	Taylor (MS)
McIntyre	Riley	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Rivers	Terry
McKinney	Rodriguez	Thomas
McNulty	Roemer	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Rogan	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Rogers	Thornberry
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Thune
Metcalf	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Mica	Rothman	Tierney
Millender-McDonald	Roukema	Toomey
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Trafficant
Miller, Gary	Royce	Turner
Miller, George	Ryan (WI)	Udall (CO)
Minge	Ryun (KS)	Udall (NM)
Mink	Sabo	Upton
Moakley	Salmon	Velazquez
Mollohan	Sanchez	Vento
Moore	Sanders	Visclosky
Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Vitter
Moran (VA)	Sawyer	Walden
Morella	Saxton	Walsh
Murtha	Schakowsky	Wamp
Myrick	Scott	Waters
Nadler	Serrano	Watkins
Napolitano	Sessions	Watt (NC)
Nethercutt	Shadegg	Watts (OK)
Ney	Shaw	Waxman
Northup	Shays	Weiner
Norwood	Sherman	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Oberstar	Shimkus	Weller
Obey	Shows	Wexler
Olver	Shuster	Weygand
Ortiz	Simpson	Whitfield
Ose	Sisisky	Wicker
Owens	Skeen	Wilson
Oxley	Skelton	Wise
Packard	Slaughter	Wolf
Pascarella	Smith (MI)	Woolsey
Pastor	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Pease	Smith (TX)	Wynn
Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
	Snyder	Young (FL)

## NAYS—9

Herger	Paul	Schaffer
Holden	Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Pombo	Tiahrt

## NOT VOTING—30

Blunt	Fattah	McIntosh
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Menendez
Buyer	Jefferson	Neal
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Pallone
Carson	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Castle	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Rush
Collins	Knollenberg	Sanford
Cooksey	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Farr	Martinez	Towns

□ 1918

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT REGARDING ADOPTED ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The pending business is

the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2886.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2886, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

## YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Cox	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Coyne	Gutknecht
Aderholt	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Allen	Crane	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Crowley	Hansen
Archer	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Armey	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Danner	Hayes
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hayworth
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hefley
Baldacci	Davis (VA)	Herger
Baldwin	Deal	Hill (IN)
Ballenger	DeFazio	Hill (MT)
Barcia	DeGette	Hilleary
Barr	Delahunt	Hilliard
Barrett (NE)	DeLauro	Hinchey
Barrett (WI)	DeLay	Hinojosa
Bartlett	DeMint	Hobson
Barton	Deutsch	Hoefel
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Bateman	Dickey	Holden
Becerra	Dicks	Holt
Bentsen	Dingell	Hooley
Bereuter	Dixon	Horn
Berkley	Doggett	Hostettler
Berman	Dooley	Houghton
Berry	Doolittle	Hoyer
Biggert	Doyle	Hulshof
Bilbray	Dreier	Hunter
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hutchinson
Bishop	Dunn	Hyde
Blagojevich	Edwards	Inslee
Bliley	Ehlers	Isakson
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Istook
Blunt	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Boehlert	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	English	(TX)
Bonilla	Eshoo	Jenkins
Bonior	Etheridge	John
Bono	Evans	Johnson, E.B.
Borski	Everett	Jones (NC)
Boswell	Ewing	Kanjorski
Boucher	Filner	Kaptur
Boyd	Fletcher	Kasich
Brady (TX)	Foley	Kelly
Brown (FL)	Forbes	Kennedy
Brown (OH)	Ford	Kildee
Bryant	Fossella	Kilpatrick
Burr	Fowler	Kind (WI)
Burton	Frank (MA)	King (NY)
Callahan	Franks (NJ)	Kingston
Calvert	Frost	Klecza
Campbell	Gallegly	Kolbe
Canady	Ganske	Kucinich
Cannon	Gejdenson	Kuykendall
Capps	Gekas	LaFalce
Capuano	Gephardt	LaHood
Cardin	Gibbons	Lampson
Castle	Gilchrest	Lantos
Chabot	Gillmor	Largent
Chambliss	Gilman	Larson
Chenoweth-Hage	Gonzalez	Latham
Clay	Goode	LaTourette
Clayton	Goodlatte	Lazio
Clement	Goodling	Leach
Clyburn	Gordon	Lee
Coble	Goss	Levin
Coburn	Graham	Lewis (CA)
Combest	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Condit	Green (TX)	Linder
Cook	Green (WI)	Lipinski
Costello	Greenwood	LoBiondo



Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)

## NOT VOTING—29

Brady (PA)  
Buyer  
Camp  
Carson  
Collins  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Cubin  
Farr  
Fattah

## □ 1927

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. GERALD R. FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the

concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 196.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 196, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

## YEAS—402

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cook  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane

McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman

## NOT VOTING—31

Brady (PA)  
Buyer  
Camp  
Carson  
Collins  
Cooksey  
Dicks  
Farr  
Fattah  
Frelinghuysen  
Gutierrez

## □ 1935

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence, I was unable to attend the House of Representatives on several votes. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 2140; "aye" on final passage on H.R. 2886; "aye" on final passage on H. Con. Res. 196; "nay" on the motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce/Justice State Appropriations Bill; and "aye" on approving the Journal.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair redesignates the time for the resumption of the proceedings on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) until Tuesday, October 19.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2260, PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today a "dear colleague" letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet later this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2260, the Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules up in H-312 of the Capitol by 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 20. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Commerce on October 13. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the committee. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments to both bills are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

I would like to inform members of the Committee on Rules that we are going to be meeting in 10 minutes upstairs for the consideration of two measures.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2670 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. UPTON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system).

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 14, I missed five votes because I was in Texas on official House business. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall 500;

yes on 501; no on 502; no on 503; and no on 504.

## APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON ONLINE CHILD PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 1405(b) of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on Online Child Protection:

Mr. John Bastian, Illinois, engaged in the business of providing Internet filtering or blocking services or software; Mr. William L. Schrader, Virginia, engaged in the business of providing Internet access services;

Mr. Stephen Blakam, Washington, D.C., engaged in the business of providing labeling or ratings services;

Mr. J. Robert Flores, Virginia, an academic expert in the field of technology;

Mr. William Parker, Virginia, engaged in the business of making content available over the Internet.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## THE AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this institution have been highly critical of the American pharmaceutical industry. Maybe, maybe we have been a bit too harsh. From a market perspective, drug companies are doing everything they should be doing. We cannot blame drug companies for maximizing their profits. That is their job. Nor can we blame the Federal Government for taking steps to protect seniors and the uninsured and to address the ramifications of what drug companies are doing to the disadvantaged. That is our job.

To address this issue, I have introduced H.R. 2927 to bring down prices without taking away the industry's incentive to act like an industry. My bill promotes good, old-fashioned American competition. The Affordable Prescription Drug Act does not use price controls, does not use regulations to bring down prescription drug prices. What my bill does is reduce drug industry power and increase consumer power by subjecting the drug industry to the same competitive forces that other industries bear. It is a means of moderating prices that are too high without inadvertently setting prices that are too low.

Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place for the U.S. for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices come to mind, the legislation would establish product licenses for essential prescription drugs. If, based on criteria published by the Department of Commerce, a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no semblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug manufacturers to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic drug companies could then sell competing products before the brand name patent expires, paying the patent holder royalties for that right.

The patent holder would still be amply rewarded for being the first on the market, and Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices.

Alternatively, a drug company could voluntarily lower its prices, which would preclude the Federal Government from being involved, from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, prescription drug prices come down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited, detailed information on drug company expenses. Given that these companies are repeatedly asking us to accept a status quo that is bankrupting seniors and fueling health care inflation, they have kept us guessing about their true costs for far too long. We can continue to buy into drug industry threats that research and development will dry up unless we continue to shelter them from competition. The argument, however, Mr. Speaker, falls apart when we actually look at how R&D is funded today.

Long story short, it is mostly funded by American taxpayers. Fifty percent of research and development for new drugs in this country is done by the Federal Government, by local governments and by foundations. The other 50 percent that the drug company spends, the Federal Government, Congress, has bestowed tax breaks on those companies for those dollars they do spend. The drug companies turn around and thank U.S. consumers by charging us two times, three times, four times what consumers in other countries pay.

We pay for half the research. We give tax breaks on the dollars they do spend. They turn around and charge American consumers twice or three times what consumers of prescription drugs pay in every other country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we can do nothing or we can dare to challenge the drug industry on behalf of seniors and every health care consumer in this country. We should take a serious look at the Allen bill, the Berry-Sanders bill, the Brown bill. There is no excuse for inaction.

□ 1945

I urge my colleagues to support lowering the cost of prescription medicine. Let us act responsibly before it is too late.

# KAZAKHSTAN MAKING PROGRESS IN DEMOCRACY, FREE MARKETS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I return this week from monitoring an election in Kazakhstan. The election to the lower house of Kazakhstan's parliament, the Majilis, has been described by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as a "tentative step in the country's transition to democracy."

While the election was not perfect, the Kasakhs acknowledged this, it was an important step toward true representative self-government.

I have heard many negative comments towards the Kasakh government recently. Certainly the attempted transfer of MIG 21s to North Korea was a major security concern for the United States. However, the Kasakh government dealt with this matter swiftly, fired those responsible, and put in place mechanisms to prevent this from occurring again.

More importantly, we are not hearing the positive steps occurring in Kazakhstan. The Kasakh government is privatizing state assets, encouraging small business, and taking seriously the business of doing, of building real democratic institutions. Do not forget, voluntarily, Kazakhstan unilaterally disarmed its nuclear arsenal.

The United States needs to recognize that this secular nation, bordered by Russia on the north, China to the east, and several nations to the south and west that may export Islamic fundamentalism, really wants an economic and strategic relationship with us.

They understand that we want to see evolving liberal democratic institutions, free markets, and a real respect for human rights. We need to understand that Kazakhstan has only 7 years under its belt as an independent nation, and that they are taking important steps in these matters.

Let us look at Kazakhstan as an evolving partner, and let us reward their important steps in the fields of democracy, free markets, human rights with a stronger diplomatic and economic relationship. I invite my colleagues to visit this beautiful country and see for themselves the progress that is being made.

## MEDICARE PAYMENTS AND THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we kicked off Voices Against Violence, a congressional teen conference with a goal of involving young people

in a nationwide debate on ways for legislators and others to prevent youth violence, both nationally and in local schools and communities. More than 400 students from across the country will participate in the teen conference. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for his leadership in making this conference possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss an issue that is very important to the citizens of my State of Florida. The cuts in the Medicare and Medicaid payments to the health providers in my State are causing a crisis.

With Florida's large senior population, no other single payer impacts health care providers in the State more than Medicare. With almost 3 million Medicare beneficiaries, Florida has the second largest Medicare population in the United States. Almost one in every five Floridians qualify for Medicare, the highest percent of any State in the country. Unfortunately for those hard-working people, the cuts in Medicare funding in the Balanced Budget Act are preventing them from getting the care that they need and deserve.

Florida's home health agencies, skilled nursing facilities, medical equipment providers, Teaching and Disproportionate Share Hospitals are in a state of crisis. Especially in the rural areas, these organizations are being forced to bear an extreme financial burdens, causing them to stretch their budgets dangerously thin and forcing them to provide substandard care to their patients.

Every single day in my office I receive calls and letters from patients and their providers who tell me horror stories of people being sent home early from the hospital, having therapy cut off before they are properly healed, and being denied care altogether. This is not right.

I hear from my colleagues that we have a huge surplus that we need to give back to the people. This Congress can start giving it back to the people by providing adequate funding for the health care for our seniors who have already paid for it and so desperately need it.

I am glad to hear that my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means are moving forward on this issue, and I am looking forward to working with them to restore these dangerous cuts. Let us do the right thing and restore these massive cuts in Medicare reimbursement.

## CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO BE AWARDED TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, we passed a resolution allowing the use of the rotunda for a ceremony to grant a Congressional

Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Ford. I would like to give some background information on that award. I was very pleased to sponsor the bill that would grant them this medal because they have served this country so well for so many years.

What is unique about this medal, this particular medal, and what is different than any previous medal in history, is that it will be awarded to both President and Mrs. Ford. I believe it very important to recognize the part that both of them played in the history of our country.

Mrs. Ford contributed a great deal to the health of the women of this Nation by discussing very frankly and openly the fact that she had breast cancer. Now, that may seem rather mundane today, but at the time she developed breast cancer, she was the First Lady in the White House. Breast cancer was not discussed in polite society. It was whispered about. As a result, many women did not know what caused breast cancer. They did not know about self-examination. They did not know what treatments were available.

Mrs. Ford announced that she had this terrible disease. She described the symptoms to this Nation. She worked with the media to publicize the nature of breast cancer. She was very effective in alerting the women of this Nation to the need for breast examination and treatment.

In addition to that, later on in life, due to a number of pain medications that she was taking and the use of alcohol, Mrs. Ford recognized the need for treatment for alcoholism and drug dependency and started the Betty Ford Clinic. This has been a life-saving institution for many, many people. She still takes a personal interest in it, still visits with new patients as they come in, and has been very effective in helping many people recover from substance abuse or alcohol abuse.

President Ford, of course, is well known as the President who healed our Nation after the resignation from office of President Nixon. However, since we have almost a generation elapsed since President Ford held office, I find many people simply are not aware of what was happening at that time and the incredible turmoil that this Nation felt at the time that President Nixon was undergoing examination by the Congress, facing impeachment, and eventually resigning from office.

When President Ford took that office, he, in a very calm and deliberate manner, proceeded to heal this Nation. He restored order. He restored financial stability. He reduced interest rates. He improved the economy and showed that our government could survive a crisis like that and function well. For this, he deserves our thanks and our commendation.

Because of this and because of the actions of both President and Mrs. Ford, I thought it very deserving that they receive the Congressional Gold Medal. This will be presented to them next

week in the rotunda of the Capitol. I urge all Members to attend, and I urge also the citizens of this country to join me in applauding both Jerry and Betty Ford, President and Mrs. Ford, for their selfless service to this country for all the good that they have done for all of us.

#### VOICES AGAINST VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I too rise today with great pleasure to stand and welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, D.C. to participate in Voices Against Violence, a congressional teen conference sponsored by the office of the Democratic leader and the Democratic Caucus.

However, these young people come from all over the country, and many of them come from so many different walks of life and, might I say, from different political parties. This is a bipartisan summit. Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issues of youth violence and how it impacts their lives.

I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston, and I met them at the airport this afternoon as they arrived in Washington, D.C. As they communicated with me their desires, each of them said they came to listen, but they also came to provide solutions.

They want to see more opportunities for parents and schoolteachers and counselors to listen to students. They want to find ways to help students who are concerned or have problems and pressures not to explode like what happened in Columbine, but to have resources where they can talk. These young people mean business, and they have come to work.

Young people live in a different world than what existed about 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise, and we are poised on a dawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic, more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people. These young people want the violence to stop.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in schools. Others will even say that the increase of youth crimes is the symptom of a larger breakdown of our society. But I believe these young people will be instructive as they come to Washington.

I welcome Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School, Eric Del Toro from Barbara Jordan High School, Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School, and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School, along with Dr. Alma Allen, the chaperrone, a member of the Texas Board of Education and school administrator from the HISD.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the caucus leader, for helping to sponsor this conference.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that we started out with a sense of hope for these young people coming here. I am disappointed, however, as I speak about another issue, that as the Commerce, State, Justice appropriation bill comes to the floor of the House, the conferees have decided or rejected the idea of adding to it the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999. What a travesty inasmuch as the Senate bill did have this legislation.

In the light of the tragedies that have occurred in Illinois, in light of the tragedies that occurred in my own State of Texas with James Byrd being dismembered by hateful acts, those who promoted racist provocations and acts, along with the activities of the killing of Matthew Shepard, but many, many others, these are just examples of hateful acts in America.

For those who would say that other crimes are equal to hateful acts, that any murder is hateful, they are absolutely wrong. I wish they would understand what the hate stands for. It stands for the intimidation of large groups of people.

When James Byrd was killed and dismembered, it was not intended just to say something to James Byrd. It was intended to tell African Americans that they do not stand equal in this country, that they can be dismembered in this brutal manner. When Matthew Shepard was killed, it was intended to show gays and lesbians that they are not equal in this Nation.

Hate crimes intimidate groups. When is this Congress going to understand that, in order to make a national statement about who we are as Americans as we go into the 21st century, we need a national position as we did with the Voter Rights Act in 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that we stand against hate crimes?

It is a travesty and a shame that this appropriations bill would not have the inclusion of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 similar to what the other body did. We are going to fight it, and we are going to prevail because good people in America will prevail over evil.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand tonight to welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, DC, to participate in "Voices Against Violence," a congressional teen conference sponsored by the Office of the Democrat Leader and the Democratic Caucus.

Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issue of youth violence and its effect on their lives. I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston.

Young people live in a different world than what existed just 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise and we are poised on the dawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic and more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in public schools. Others would even say that the increase of youth crime is a symptom of a larger breakdown in the moral fabric of society.

By now, we know that the problem of youth violence cannot be traced to a single cause or source. At the same time, we here in Congress have formed various working groups and task forces to address this issue, because we are all searching for some answers and solutions to youth violence.

It is now appropriate that we have now turned our attention to our children, and to take the time to hear from them. Not all of our young people are caught up in the cycle of violence. We know that 95% of all young people are good kids who want to do the right thing. Too often, we focus on the bad elements and overlook these children.

This conference gives us an opportunity to make up for our neglect of this 95%. The purpose of this conference is to go beyond pointing fingers at the various causes of youth violence, and to discuss tangible solutions. The solutions that will be offered these next 2 days will come from our children.

It is refreshing to hear the perspective of young people on solutions to youth violence. Last month, during the Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference, some young people participated in the Juvenile Justice forum I sponsored and shared some unique insights into the problem of youth violence.

I was enlightened by the views of these young people, especially the views of the young men who were very articulate and insightful about their experiences. One young man spoke eloquently of what he thought were the negative perceptions he faced as a young Black man.

This is the type of dialogue I hope the young people will engage in as they discuss solutions to youth violence. The close to 400 participants will get to discuss these issues with the President and other policy makers to help us understand their perspective on this problem.

I hope that these teens will come away from this conference with a new understanding of each other that they can take back to their communities.

I am pleased to have four students from my district in Houston here to participate in the conference—Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School; Eric Del Toro from

Barbara Jordan High School; Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School; and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School.

I would like to thank the Houston community for assisting us in bringing these students to Washington. I would also like to thank Dr. Alma Allen, a member of the Texas State Board of Education and School Administrator from the Houston Independent School District who has accompanied the students as a chaperone.

I strongly urge my colleagues to participate in this conference to listen to the concerns of our young people. As I stated earlier, we have had many hearings, conferences, working groups and debates on this issue in which we relied on the expertise of trained adults to tell us about the problem. Now it is time to listen to our young people for their view.

I would like to thank the Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT and Caucus Leader MARTIN FROST for sponsoring this conference. Although the conference is being sponsored by the Democrat Party, we have bipartisan support in the form of Republican offices that have sent students. I thank everyone who has worked so hard since this summer to put this event together.

Finally, I thank the young people who came from all across the country to participate. I urge you to raise your voices against violence loud and clear—especially now because we are listening.

#### LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, like no other creatures on Earth, human beings have the unique ability to communicate through language. We can communicate feelings of love or hope or anxiety or suspense or excitement, all conveying feelings of emotions, feelings of concern. We do that through language. We use the English language and all the other languages of the world which are spoken through human beings who try to convey those feeling accordingly.

We have over the years respected great writers like Shakespeare and people in politics like Lincoln and Kennedy and the poetry of Robert Frost, and the magic word of Byron and Keats and Shelley as poets. George Will in today's world is a master of the word, of speaking effectively and carefully and with great meaning.

□ 2000

The reason I mention this today, Mr. Speaker, is that over the years I think we have seen a reduction in the respect for the English language and what words mean, how grammar is expressed or not expressed, whether it is proper or not. And just last Thursday we saw, on CBS television, a new low in expression for millions of people to see and observe and listen to on national television.

There was a show called Chicago Hope, and there was a headline in USA

Today following that show entitled Chicago Hope Breaks the Barrier. Well, this is the barrier that Chicago Hope broke. It was the barrier of obscenity and foul language that I think we have not seen in any time in our history on television, on network television.

The actor involved, Mark Harmon, plays a doctor, apparently, and he was before a medical review board to explain why a promising teenage baseball pitcher had to have his arm amputated, the story says, when an infection set in and, following a series of operations, was unable to play, apparently. So this doctor on television, a revered profession in our society, by the way, said "blank happens." The USA article says, "Blank happens," Harmon said, using an epithet for excrement. Neither a CBS spokesman nor Henry Bromwell, executive producer of the series, could remember a time when censors had allowed the word to be used. "It's nothing I haven't tried a couple of times before, except this time I won," Bromwell said."

Apparently the word was expected to be used for artistic truthfulness. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the American public has, I hope, had a bit of enough about artistic expression on national television with a captive audience that breaks new barriers, not new high barriers but new low barriers. What a distinction for CBS television. How proud they must be that this barrier has now been reduced even lower. The standards for conduct, for language, for propriety, for dignity, for expression has now reached a new low for CBS and this so-called entertainment show.

Now, it is one thing to pay money and go to the movies and watch trash, which there is plenty of in today's society. If individuals want to do that, people have the right in a free society to do that. But on national television, before a national audience, to somehow be proud of the breaking of this new low barrier, I fear, says volumes about television today and the entertainment industry.

Are there no bounds in the entertainment industry on television? I suspect there may not be, as these new lows keep being reached by people who are somehow proud of this low-class artistic expression as defined by some producer who feels that he is somehow trying to make his mark. He has made his mark all right. He has made a low mark.

I would urge Americans who are disgusted with this kind of language and the lowness of it and the failure of the language to be expressive in a dignified and acceptable societal way to write CBS News and give them all that they can express about their disapproval for this kind of activity.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there was not time allowed in the debate on foreign aid, and I wanted to make some comments, and so I will do so now.

First of all, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), made a statement that more money was available to Ronald Reagan for foreign aid. Well, that is because the Democrats controlled spending. There was always more money available, without any regard to a balanced budget. Ronald Reagan decreased taxes, he did not increase taxes like the President plans to do, \$74 billion worth. And he only had control of the Senate for one term. The Democrats controlled Congress, where spending is originated and voted for.

After Ronald Reagan, the Democrats continued spending with no regard for a balanced budget. All additional revenue that the tax decrease brought in, they spent. And that was not enough, they raided the Social Security Trust Fund and used it as a slush fund to pay for such things as welfare, that was wasted in many cases. There are many families that need welfare, but not the 40 percent that was eliminated, and now the President lauds, after he vetoed our bill twice.

They are trying to do the same thing now that they did when they had control of the House, spend more than the balanced budget. To do so, they have to take it out of Social Security or the President has to identify where he would take the money from. He will not do that, because in each of his budgets he has said, I will make cuts in the fifth year, when he would not even be here. And then he refuses to tell where those cuts would come, except for defense, because he knows it would make people mad at him.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that the Democrats did more for Social Security. I think that is a joke. In 1993, they increased the taxes on Social Security. For 30 years they stole the money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. There is zero money in that fund, but they will say, oh, there are notes in there and they are guaranteed. But they are not backed up with gold; they are only backed up by the U.S. Government. And the only way to make those Social Security notes valuable is to put the money in there. When there is a surplus, the money can be put back in there. The Republicans have said we are going to put a lockbox on it and make it a trust fund not a slush fund, but yet the President wants to take the money out.

Remember, in 1993, he not only increased the taxes on Social Security, he increased the taxes on the middle income. I think using the term middle class is a terrible term to use. There are no middle-class citizens in this country. They may be low income,

they may be middle income or high income, but yet the Democrat leadership continues to use class warfare, and I think it is wrong.

We are not going to take the dollars from Americans, but yet the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the billions of dollars is just a little bit, a good investment. Well, that little bit we already funded Africa at the same level, but they want more. They want more money not for American citizens but for foreigners, out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and I think that is wrong. The President vetoed it. They also want back the majority, but I think it is going to backfire.

The President wants more spending for Africa, but yet the President, in his trip this spring to Africa, took 1,700 staffers and press, 1,700, at a cost of \$47 million. Africa would have loved the \$47 million extra and let the President stay home.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) quoted the Constitution of the United States. Well, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is our libertarian. I do not agree with everything he says, but he, if anybody, is a constitutionalist on spending. He votes against almost everything. But the Democrats vote against the Constitution every single day, in my opinion.

Remember when the President said he wanted 100 percent for Social Security in his address before Congress and the American people? Well, 3 weeks later he came back and said, no, 62 percent, and then 15 percent for Medicare. And what he does not tell us, and why we do not trust this President, is because he takes \$100 billion out of Social Security and Medicare. He increases taxes \$74 billion, and he spends it for brand new social spending. Not even the old social spending, new social spending. And we said no, Mr. President, we are going to put that money in a lockbox, not spend it, we are going to accrue those savings to protect Social Security and Medicare forever.

But yet now the President wants to take the money out. And we are saying absolutely not. We are going to send this bill back to the President. We are not going to spend money unless the President identifies where he wants those cuts to come from or unless he spends Social Security money.

I want my colleagues to look up WWW.DSAUSA.ORG, Democrat Socialists of America. They list the progressive caucus. There are 58 Democrats listed under the Democrat Socialists of America.

#### CONCERNS ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND POPULATION GROWTH IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue of great concern to me, I think of a number of people in the United States of America, but an issue that seldom makes its way to the point of being a topic of debate here in the Congress of the United States, and that is because, quite frankly, there are many, many people who are concerned, actually afraid, to bring this topic forward. I am talking specifically about the issue of immigration into the United States. And I mean massive immigration, immigration both legal and illegal.

I want to talk tonight about some of the effects of this particular phenomenon, because I believe they are detrimental; and I believe that we should confront them, even though it is sort of, politically anyway, very scary to do so.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States from foreign countries; and these numbers have inflated our population to over 272 million. Mr. Speaker, the other day the world's population, we are told, reached 6 billion. Several cartoons have appeared in the papers in my State of Colorado depicting this phenomenon and saying that we are reaching a point where the resources of the country, of the Nation, of the world cannot support this kind of population growth.

Well, I do not know what is the critical mass in terms of population growth that the world can sustain, but I know in the United States we are reaching the point where growth is impacting upon us quite dramatically. Certainly it is in my State of Colorado. We are facing now at least two bond issues on our ballot in November dealing specifically with the issue of growth, both in terms of highway construction and how to deal with the massive increase in the numbers of people that have come to Colorado, and light rail construction totaling several billion dollars anyway, and then, of course, there are all the school bond issues we are going to face. This is just in Colorado. It is happening all over the country because of growth.

But where is this growth coming from? Is it from the population of the United States, the natural born population of this country? Are we experiencing just this kind of pressure because people in the United States are having children in such numbers that they are placing these burdens on our infrastructure? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not because of that kind of population growth. It is because of immigration policies.

We, tonight, are looking at immigration numbers that I just mentioned, of somewhere close to a million legal, and that is just legal immigrants. That does not count what we call refugee status, people coming in. It certainly does not count illegal immigrants. Every year there is a net increase. I mean we have a lot of people coming into the country illegally, everybody

knows that. Some of them leave, go back to their native country, but many stay. So there is a net increase every year of at least this amount of legal immigrants. And it is difficult to count, of course, but we know that the pressures are there.

One State in which this pressure is evidenced day in and day out, besides the State of Colorado, of course, is the State of Texas. And there are a number of border States across the United States that are heavily influenced by this and that things are changing dramatically in those States, not just in terms of infrastructure costs, but there are a number of changes that are impacting those States that I think deserve to be discussed.

□ 2015

With me tonight to do that is a colleague of mine, I should say a mentor specifically on this issue. Because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has been laboring in this vineyard for many, many, many years, far more than I; and I do look to him and his leadership in this area. I am pleased that he is joining me tonight to discuss this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), for yielding me time; and I appreciate his giving me the opportunity tonight to be able to make some comments of my own on such an important subject.

But first I want to thank him for his giving the attention to such a complex, sensitive and yet important subject that it deserves and also thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) for his expertise and for his knowledge of immigration, which I think provides a great contribution to those of us here in the House who certainly can benefit from his personal knowledge, firsthand knowledge, of immigration as it impacts his State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the destructive effect of our current immigration policy. It is having a destructive impact on recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens and also how a more enlightened immigration policy would benefit American minorities and, in fact, the overall American economy.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States. Of these, about 300,000 have less than a high school education and their competition for scarce jobs does have a destructive impact on the opportunity of American workers with no more than a high school diploma who are disproportionately and unfortunately recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens.

Mr. Speaker, among reports of a growing, prospering economy are other more troubling reports on a growing



gap between the well-to-do and the working poor. The national unemployment rate is about 4 percent; where, for those with less than a high school education, it is more than twice as high, over 8 percent.

In many cities where there are high recent immigrant populations, the unemployment rates are in double digits for those with less education. Where is opportunity for these individuals and their families?

Numerous polls indicate that black and Hispanic Americans know this only too well. This is no surprise, given that they are hurt disproportionately by our immigration policy today. We cannot pretend that the adverse impact of mass immigration on minorities does not exist. We can and should find solutions to protect the jobs and wages of recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens.

How often do we read about the long-term unemployed or the working poor or single mothers with no mention of the serious impact of immigration on their employment wages and working conditions? How often do we hear comments about the growing gap between the well-to-do and the working poor that do not mention that almost half the relative decline in wages of those who do not finish high school is caused, in fact, by competition from immigration?

Think of a single mother barely surviving in a minimum wage job who sees her annual wages depressed by \$2,000 because she must compete with more and more unskilled immigrants. She very well might be a recent immigrant herself seeking a better life for herself and her children, or she might be able to trace her roots in this country back generations and is simply seeking the American dream that has been denied her ancestors.

Think what she can do for herself and her children with that lost money. Buy a used car so she does not have to take a bus to work. Put a down payment on a modest home. Or even fix the furnace before winter comes. Worse, think what would happen if she actually loses her job because of the never-ending competition from new arrivals.

It is certainly not the immigrants themselves who are to blame and who understandably want to come to America. It is our immigration policy that is to blame. But who knows how many people have been hurt by the unintended consequences of our outdated immigration policy.

A series of recent studies have all documented the effects of immigration policy on low-skilled American workers and recent immigrants. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences concludes that immigration was responsible for about 44 percent of the total decline in relative wages of high school dropouts between 1980 and 1994.

The Rand Corporation reports that in California the widening gap between the number of jobs available for non-

college-educated workers and the increasing number of new noncollege-educated immigrants signals growing competition for jobs and, hence, a further decline in the relative earnings at the low end of the labor market.

The U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, finds that "immigration of unskilled immigrants comes at a cost to unskilled U.S. workers."

The Hudson Institute states that "U.S. immigration policy serves primarily to increase the number of U.S. residents who lack even a high school degree. America must stop recruiting workers for jobs that do not exist or exist only at the lowest wages."

The Brookings Institute published a paper concluding that "immigration has had a marked adverse impact on the economic status of the least skilled U.S. workers."

The Center for Immigration Studies calculates that immigration may reduce the wages of the average native in a low-skilled occupation by over \$1,900 a year.

CIS also found that the poverty rate for persons living in immigrant households of 1997 was 22 percent, almost double the 12 percent rate for persons in native households.

It concluded that reducing the flow of less skilled immigrants who enter each year would have the desirable effect of reducing job competition between more established immigrants and new arrivals for low-wage jobs. Reducing the supply of this kind of labor would create upward pressure on wages and benefits for the working poor, including immigrants already in the country. Over time, this should reduce poverty among immigrants who work.

These studies reinforce what common sense already tells us.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, add three other facts together. First, immigrants will account for half of the increase in the workforce in the 1990s.

Second, the skilled level of immigrants relative to Americans has been declining for years. Thirty-five percent of immigrant workers who have arrived since 1990 do not have a high school education, compared to only 9 percent of native-born workers. Some 300,000 illegal immigrants without high school educations arrived last year and will total 3 million this decade.

Third, close to 90 percent of all future jobs in America will require more than a high school education.

The mismatch is clear. Nearly half of all immigrants today are not prepared for the jobs of the future. Current immigration policy has many Americans and recent immigrants competing with hundreds of thousands of newcomers without high school degrees for a fixed number of low-skilled jobs. This is a recipe for disaster for millions of blue-collar workers and their families.

No one should complain about the plight of the working poor or the persistence of minority unemployment or

the levels of income inequality in America without acknowledging the unintended consequences of our present immigration policy.

Of course, immigration is neither all good nor all bad. Immigrants benefit America in many ways. But we should design our immigration policies so that it enhances rather than diminishes opportunity for American workers. We should protect the jobs of working Americans, and we can make a better life for all Americans wherever they were born.

Just as American minorities would benefit from a reduced number of low-skilled immigrants, the American economy and American firms trying to prosper in this era of global competition would benefit enormously from an increased flow of more educated immigrants. American industry is pleading for more skilled and educated workers.

The chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers recently stated that "the shortage of skilled employees is not a distant threat anymore. The skills gap is now catching up to us and could threaten the amazing growth and productivity gains of the past decade. Finding an adequate supply of qualified employees is the number one issue for American industry today."

NAM found that 88 percent of manufacturers are experiencing a shortage of qualified workers, 60 percent find that current workers lack basic math skills and that 55 percent find serious deficiencies in workers' basic writing and comprehension skills. These problems can be solved with more educated workers. And because immigration accounts for such a high percentage of workforce growth, almost one-half, an emphasis on more educated immigrants would be an important part of the solution. The result would be a more productive American economy and more productive American businesses. As the productivity of the American economy increases, so will the prosperity of all Americans.

American citizens and legal residents will benefit in another way from more educated immigrants. To borrow a line from a new book by George Borjas, "Skilled immigrants earn more, pay higher taxes, and require fewer social services than less skilled immigrants."

The National Academy of Sciences states that over his or her lifetime, each immigrant with less than a high school education will cost American taxpayers \$89,000. That is, the Government benefits consumed by each immigrant will exceed taxes they paid by \$89,000.

To citizens concerned about how we are to rebuild our schools and protect and preserve Social Security in the next century, these numbers should set off alarms. More than 300,000 immigrant workers with less than a high school education entering our country this year will require \$27 billion more in government services and benefits than they will contribute in taxes.

That is \$27 billion, for example, that will not be available to rebuild our schools and protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare.

Next year another 300,000-plus immigrants will enter the country with less than a high school education. Over their lifetimes, they will claim another \$27 billion that could provide education and training to recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens who have less than a high school education and who are disadvantaged in our economy.

Common sense tells us that we should align our immigration policy with the needs of America. The economy is crying out for more educated workers, and one of the easiest and most cost-free ways of providing these workers is through immigration reform. Doing so would mean more economic opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, now I am happy to yield back to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) and thank him again for sharing his time tonight with me and thank him again for his attention to such an important subject and for his expertise on the subject, as well.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for his comments, and I sincerely appreciate his contribution to this discussion which I consider to be quite definitive. As I say, he has had quite some time here even in the Congress of the United States to become involved with it, and I only hope that the rest of our colleagues will pay heed to his admonitions and to his clarion call for a change in immigration policies in the United States, and I want to thank him very sincerely for his support on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, every time we talk about the issue of immigration, it always results in someone coming up and saying something like, this is a Nation of immigrants. We are all immigrants.

And it is absolutely true that, unless our heritage is native American, and even then I guess you could say that they immigrated here, of course, across the Bering Strait, we are in fact a Nation of immigrants. This is undeniable. There was a time when immigration patterns across the world were such that the United States was the recipient of many hundreds of thousands of people, going into the millions, over a period of time.

Of course, I am speaking specifically of the turn of the century, especially where the United States was the place to which people came; it was a harbinger of hope. And it still is to many millions of people throughout the world.

I totally understand it. If I were an immigrant, if I were someone not in the United States, if I were someone born in other lands, especially into poverty, I would be doing exactly the same thing that we see millions and millions of them doing; and that is trying to come here. But my responsibility is different as a Congressman in this body. It is to address the issues

that I believe are of concern and of a negative impact in terms of the general population of the country. And I believe immigration at this level, what I would certainly refer to as massive immigration, is not positive anymore.

Let me talk for a moment about the differences that exist between what we see today as immigration patterns and the situation in the United States as opposed to what it was around the turn of the century, of the last century.

The fact is that, of course, my grandparents came here about the same time as did millions of other people. And at that time this country was a place that relied upon brawn far more than anything else. We needed immigrant labor, low-skilled immigrant labor. It contributed to the capital development in this country, and it contributed to the well being of everyone.

□ 2030

The economy grew, the economic well-being of the families that emigrated grew, people prospered, and it was, generally speaking, a positive thing for the Nation. But we are in a brand new environment, a brand new environment that is not as hospitable to low-skilled labor as it was at the turn of the century. Today's needs are different. This Nation's needs are different. What we now see is that a massive immigration of low-skilled people have a detrimental effect on a number of things in the United States, including, of course, people who are at the lowest level of the economic scale. This is, I think, something that should concern us all and it is something I believe that my colleague from Texas addressed very clearly and very articulately, that the people in the United States that we find in most need of help are those people who are detrimentally affected by massive immigration. By the way, never before in our Nation's history, never, even at the beginning of the century, have we ever experienced the numbers of immigrants as we are presently that are a result of, quote, legal immigration alone, let alone illegal immigration. The numbers are far greater today than they ever were before. At present, just over 60 percent of the population growth in the United States is due to immigration. By 2050, it will be 90 percent, with a domestic population approaching 400 million people. Even if we allowed for a zero net increase in immigration, the population would increase by almost 75 million people by 2050 because of our recent track record. That is if we stopped immigration totally, today.

From 1997 to 1998, just 1 year in Colorado, almost 10,000 immigrants moved in and 3,000 people settled in Denver alone. These are legal immigrants. Far more came in illegally. Everybody knows it. Employers know it. School districts know it. The people who try to get to work and are confronted with massive traffic jams know it. I do not mean to say that all the people on the

roads in Colorado and everywhere else, States not necessarily border States, are people who just came here from other countries, emigrated legally or illegally. But what I will tell you is that massive immigration causes a dislocation of populations, a movement of populations, and there are literally thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of people even in my State, even in Colorado, who have moved there recently as a result of population pressures in the States from which they came, California, Florida, Texas and others, those population pressures brought on by immigration. So even though it may not be specifically immigrants in Colorado that caused the massive sort of problems we have with growth, they are exacerbated by our immigration policies nationally which do affect population trends in States all over the Nation.

With this major influx of people comes an influx of problems for United States citizens. Immigrants, both legal and illegal, are affecting all aspects of life within our society. From influencing our domestic job market causing lower wages for American citizens and even other recent immigrants, to the environment where a surging population means greater stress on our natural habitat, placing a true burden on our welfare system, we are feeling the strains of massive immigration in our economy.

In 1997, the National Research Council calculated the net fiscal cost of public services to immigrants, and I want to stress here, Mr. Speaker, the net fiscal cost, because when we get into this debate about what immigrants produce, what they contribute to the society as to what they take from the government services, there is always a debate about this, because we say, after all they come here, they get jobs, they pay taxes, that is true. But when they calculate the net fiscal cost of public services to immigrants, that is, after those taxes are paid and when we include education, welfare, Medicaid, housing assistance and Social Security beyond what immigrants pay in taxes, it was between 15 to \$20 billion a year.

Now we are being asked to shoulder the burden placed on the economy of our current massive levels of immigration. In California, for example, each household must pay \$1,178 a year in added taxes to cover the services which immigrants receive each year. Then there is the issue of poverty. We address that almost daily in the Congress of the United States. In every committee this issue comes up over and over again. We are now wrestling with all of the appropriations bills and we are constantly dealing with the issue of the poverty rate in the United States and we are fighting it. We are attempting to do what the government can do to reduce poverty levels in the United States. But it is the fact that a great percentage of this, of the group that we identify as being in poverty in the United States, far over a majority, as a

matter of fact, are recent immigrants to the United States, again both legal and illegal.

Why is that? For one reason, over 300 of the legal immigrants who enter the country have less than a high school education as was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH). Likewise, the unemployment rate for people with less than a high school education is twice as high than for those with more schooling. I will tell you, also, there is another difference. I mentioned earlier there is a significant difference between what is happening in America today and what happened in America at the turn of the century with regard to immigration. When you came to the United States in 1900 as an immigrant, you had very few options in terms of what you were going to do for the rest of your life. You could work, or you could starve. There were no other options available to you. And in order to work, in order especially to progress in an upward way in order to go up the scale in America, to get a better job, to do better for your family, you had to do something else. You also had to learn English. It was an absolute necessity. It was not brought about because of any law. Well, it was a law, it was a law of economics. That is to say, if you wanted to do better in the United States, you had to learn English and you had to get a job.

Well, things are different in the United States today because of the welfare system we have in the United States, which is, by the way, bad for native-born Americans just as it is bad for immigrants, because of our insistence on issues like bilingual education and a type of bilingual education that allows children to actually try to go to school and be educated in a language other than English, and for a variety of other reasons we find ourselves looking at this immigration issue much differently than we did in 1900. It has an impact, a much more negative impact than it ever did before. One-third of the yearly immigration population is competing for jobs with a sector of society that is already plagued with high levels of unemployment.

Let us look at what is happening in our schools. Currently, there are 8 million school aged children with immigrant mothers. The influx of immigration is having dire effects on the ability to educate our children. In Los Angeles, for example, nearly two-thirds of the children in Los Angeles County schools are Hispanic and 43 percent of school children in California have parents who are immigrants. What does this mean? Well, it means, of course, larger classes. More children receive less attention. It means that precious resources for books, classroom space are being strained to the breaking point, trailers having to make do where classrooms once stood. It means a diversion of funds into remedial programs and away from the programs of hard science, math and history. It leads to racial separation between and

among schools. There are significant problems we face because just the cost of bilingual education in this country is dramatic. Certainly in my own State we have noticed that the costs of supporting a bilingual education plan in several of our districts have caused school districts to come forward and request more funds time after time. This is not even talking about the value, the relative value of bilingual education which I would certainly like to critique, because I do not believe it is of great educational benefit.

It is not just the numbers, Mr. Speaker. That, we could deal with. The fact is that yes, we will have to build more schools; yes, we will have to hire more teachers; yes, there will be pressures for greater and greater resources to address the issue of more people. But then it is what happens even afterwards, in the development of, as I say, these bilingual programs and multicultural programs that have a tendency, unfortunately, I must say this, have a tendency to balkanize America. That is the other difference between the kind of immigration patterns we saw in the early 1900s and immigration patterns today. Instead of pressures within the United States to amalgamate the people who were coming here and bring them into the melting pot, instead of having a great desire on the part of most if not all of the immigrants in the early 1900s to become part of the American experience in every single way, we are seeing something else happening with recent immigrants to the United States, in that their desire is, of course, to achieve an economic level of existence that is comparable to what we would call the typical American experience, but something happens in terms of the willingness on the part of a lot of people to accept the greater American dream. We see a tendency to balkanize America, to break ourselves up into separate little enclaves, separated by language and culture.

This has a number of detrimental effects, of course. I hope that we will have the courage to address them as we get into the greater issues of immigration policies in America. But I think they are significant and I think most people in America know to what I am referring. I am referring to this phenomenon that changes the way we think about ourselves as Americans, as opposed to one Nation, one set of ideas, one historical perspective, to a Nation totally divided into a number of different camps with different ideas about American history.

I think we should cut back, and I think we should cut back dramatically on the number of immigrants which we are allowing into the country and we should do that through the implementation of legislation such as the moratorium bill of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). We would better serve these immigrants by enabling them to have a better chance of achieving employment. Likewise, with less

numbers of total immigrants these new arrivals to the United States would have an easier time of assimilating into their new society and the future American citizen. I agree with my colleague from Texas who indicated that perhaps a different group of immigrants ought to be identified as appropriate for immigration into the United States, and that being better educated.

There is one last issue I want to address, and, that is, the issue of immigrants and crime. Criminal aliens, that is, noncitizens who commit crimes, accounted for over 25 percent of the Federal prison population in 1993. I want to say that again, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think many people realize this. But criminal aliens, noncitizens who commit crimes, accounted for over 25 percent of the Federal prison population in 1993. They also represent the fastest growing segment. This does not count naturalized immigrants who commit crimes. About 450,000 noncitizens have been convicted of crimes and are either in American jails, on probation or on parole. In May 1990, foreign-born criminals comprised 18 percent of the inmates passing through the LA County jail inmate reception center. Some 11 percent had offenses sufficiently serious to qualify them as deportable aliens. A year later, in May 1991, a follow-up study showed only half of those deportable aliens had been returned to their country of origin.

□ 2045

Over 40 percent had already been re-arrested in the United States for new offenses.

This is a result of a massive immigration problem and an immigrant policy, an immigration policy of this administration that chooses to ignore some of the most significant problems, the most significant crimes committed by people even before they come into this country. We do not go through their backgrounds, as we used to, and we end up with this kind of a problem in the United States.

I know in Colorado that a significant portion of the Colorado inmate population is made up by immigrants, both legal and illegal. The costs, again, of this kind of thing have to be added to the costs of education, costs of welfare, other costs of social services. So it is a significant issue.

The last, Mr. Speaker, and I mentioned that was the last thing; there is one more thing, Immigrants To The Public Charge. According to law, legal permanent residents are liable to be deported on a public charge if they use public benefits during their first 5 years in the United States, and although actually millions of people do this, only 41 people were deported on these grounds from 1961 to 1982.

Another issue is children under the birthright citizenship provision who are born in the United States and are automatically American citizens entitled to cash payments under the Federal Aid For Families With Dependent

Children program. Parents who often are illegal aliens are able to collect these checks, gain a foothold in the United States until their child turns 18, at which point they can be sponsored and made legal immigrants. The IRS makes no effort to prevent illegal aliens from receiving earned income tax refunds, which are sometimes payable even if no income tax is due and can exceed \$2000. If a false Social Security number is used, an IRS agent will then assign a temporary number.

Well, these are some of the more egregious examples of the problems that we experience as a result of massive immigration into this country, Mr. Speaker; and I do hope that my colleagues will pay attention to them and will try to address them both by reducing the number of legal immigrants and by enforcing that with stricter policies on the border with using, if necessary, with using the Armed Forces of the United States to protect our borders which, as a matter of fact, is a perfect reason for having an Army, and that is to protect your borders, and in this case we need that protection against a flood of immigration of illegal immigrants that are seriously jeopardizing the situation in America today.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AGREEING TO CONFERENCE REQUESTED BY SENATE ON H.R. 3064, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mr. TANCREDI), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-395) on the resolution (H. Res. 333) agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mr. TANCREDI), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-396) on the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

A NEW VISION FOR RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss Russia, the current problems that we are seeing unfold in Russia, discuss consistent with the hearings that are being held in the Committee on International Affairs and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and other committees of this Congress, the Committee on Government Reform, what impact, if any, the U.S. has had in the current economic and political turmoil inside of Russia and the former Soviet States.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that I have discussed many times on this floor in the past, and I do not just come here tonight to criticize this administration, although some of my comments will appear to do just that. I come to offer some suggestions for perhaps a new way of dealing with Russia. In fact, what I come to offer tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a new vision for Russia, a new way that this country can relate to the people in Russia who have been dominated by a centrally-controlled Communist regime for 70 years and for the last 6 years or 7 years actually by a government that was totally focused on Boris Yeltsin and the people around him.

Mr. Speaker, I want the same thing for the Russian people that the President wants, and that is a stable, free democracy, a free market system allowing the people of Russia to enjoy the benefits that we in the West and we in America enjoy. I want them to be trading partners of ours; I want them to reap the benefits of free markets; and I want them to become a partner with us in helping to ensure world stability. From my position as chairman of the National Security Research Committee, my job is to oversee \$38 billion a year of defense spending for new weapon systems and new technologies, and money of those technologies and much of that investment is focused on threats, either perceived or real, coming from Russia and the former states. So it is my interest, as a subcommittee chairman, to try to find ways to work with Russia so that perhaps we can create a more stable relationship, not have to spend so much of the taxpayers' money on building exotic new weapon systems that are designed to kill people.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I think we made a fundamental mistake in 1991. The Russia that people were so excited to throw off communism, they were so happy to finally be able to have the opportunity to enjoy the kind of democracy and free market capitalism that they saw us enjoying in the West. And in those first few months we were so excited with the leadership provided by Boris Yeltsin. And all of us were solidly behind him at the time, that I think we forgot one

very important and basic notion, that Russia's success as a democracy was not dependent upon one man. It was not going to depend upon Boris Yeltsin, but rather we should have focused on upon helping Russia establish the institutions of a democracy that would last beyond one person.

If we look at America, we can see that quite evident in our history. Yes, we have had great leaders from George Washington, to Abraham Lincoln, FDR, Ronald Reagan, all good people. But America's success is not based on individual people and the work that they do. It is based on the institutions that allow our government to have a system of checks and balances. It is based on a Constitution. It is based upon the institutions mandated in that Constitution that allow people to assume positions, but that the institution can never be circumvented by those individual people.

In our rush to help Boris Yeltsin, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our focus was wrongheaded. We were so preoccupied with reinforcing Boris Yeltsin, the man, that we forgot that Russia could not and would not succeed and become more stable unless we focused on institutions and strengthening those institutions.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me that for 7 years, as Boris Yeltsin called the parliament in Russia, the lower house, the State Duma, and the upper house, the Federation Council, repeatedly called them a bunch of misfits and rogues and crooks and thugs, and while there may be one or two in that Duma or perhaps more that would fit those categories, what we did as a country was reinforce Yeltsin's notion of what the Russian Parliament was, that it was not an institution to be taken seriously. And, therefore, the President, largely through his policies of reinforcing Boris Yeltsin, sent a message to the Russian people and to the elected leaders of the state Duma that America's policy was based on a strong Yeltsin and that we were not, in fact, concerned with helping to strengthen the institution of the state Duma and the Federation Council and those institutions that would allow Russia's Constitution and the Russian government to stabilize itself. And now we are paying the price for that, Mr. Speaker.

Yeltsin's popularity in the most recent poll in Russia is 2 percent. In fact, one poll had him being disliked by the entire electorate, which is something I cannot believe, that everyone in Russia that would be polled would say that Yeltsin was not good for Russia as a nation and that, in fact, he should be replaced.

But the most recent poll that I see, provided by one of our think tanks here in Washington, showed Yeltsin's acceptance rate in Russia at 2 percent. Now that leaves us as a country that has been Russia's closest partner in this new experiment in democracy as a country that has totally reinforced

Yeltsin at the expense of the support for other institutions inside of Russia. And therefore, with Yeltsin's popularity plummeting at 2 percent, it is no surprise that the Russian people, and the Russian Duma and the Federation Council see America as an equal partner to the problems that Boris Yeltsin has brought to Russia, the problems of the threat of billions of dollars of IMF money, the problem of the misappropriation of dollars that were supposed to go to help stabilize Russia's economy and help create a middle class, the problems of a Russia that has not had control of its technology and has allowed proliferation to occur on an ongoing basis.

So now, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a very difficult position, that the Russia that is, in fact, no longer supportive of Boris Yeltsin in fact no longer has trust for America's interests. We do not have to just look at the words that support this, Mr. Speaker. Just a few short months ago there were thousands of Russian young people, old people, standing outside of our embassy in Moscow, throwing rocks and bricks at the American embassy, something we had never seen, even under communism. We did not see massive demonstrations against our country; but recently, in the last several years, that is exactly what we have seen.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the Russian Duma members perhaps summed it up best when he was visiting Washington in May of this year. I stood next to him at a press conference, and he was talking about the Russian perception of our involvement in Kosovo, and this is what he said. He said:

"You know America, for 70 years the Soviet Communist Party spent tens of billions of dollars to convince the Russian people that America was an evil Nation and that American people were evil, and they failed. But," he said, "You know, in just a few short months and a few short years your administration has done what the Soviet Communist Party could not do. It has convinced the Russian people that America's intentions are not honorable, that in fact you have supported Yeltsin every step of the way, even when he's been out of line, even when he has overseen the misuse of dollars, even when friends, the oligarchs who started and who run many of the Russian banks have, in fact, siphoned money away from the Russian people, put it into Swiss bank accounts and U.S. real estate investments, leaving the Russian government and the Russian people to pay those loans back even though that money was misappropriated."

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our policies in regard to Russia have not been successful?

Now there are committees of this body and the other body holding hearings that started in September and will continue through the end of October and November about Russia. Some

would characterize these hearings as: Who Lost Russia? Mr. Speaker, I am one that is convinced that Russia is not yet lost, but I do think it is certainly appropriate for the American people and its leaders to look at what happened and what went wrong. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this administration has to bear a significant part of the responsibility for Russia's economic and political turmoil today.

But we cannot just stop by pointing fingers at this administration because the logical response is: Well, what would you have done differently? It is easy to criticize, but what different approach would you take? And also the criticism would be such that the administration would say, well, hindsight is always 20-20. It is easy to say what we could have done, but where were you while these last 7 years unfolded?

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise tonight, because over the past 7 years I have not been silent. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, working with the Russian members in the state Duma, I started a caucus to deal with Russians on energy because I knew that helping them develop their energy resources was the quickest way to bring in hard currency to help stabilize Russia's economy, and so working with those Duma deputies from energy-rich regions, we got our energy companies together: Occidental, Mobil, Marathon, the key companies that wanted to do business in Russia to see if we could not encourage joint ventures and, in the process, encourage the Duma to pass production sharing laws, which they did twice, to allow American companies to invest in Russian energy.

And it was 5 years ago that we began a process of engaging the Duma on Russia's environmental problems to make sure that we were helping Russia deal with its nuclear waste issues and the problems of clean air and clean water and maintaining an environment for the Russian people to live and to work in, and it was the day that the current speaker of the Russian Duma was elected to that post that I was in Moscow almost 6 years ago with a letter from then Speaker Gingrich inviting the Speaker of the Russian Duma to engage the Congress in a formal way, an institutional relationship with the Congress so that we could begin the process of helping strengthen and helping to empower the parliament in Russia so that it could play its rightful role in making sure that Russia's democracy succeeded.

For the past 6 years, Mr. Speaker, working with my colleague on the other side, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) we have led delegation after delegation to Moscow and St. Petersburg, and we have hosted delegation after delegation to Washington.

□ 2100

We have discussed issues that confront us, and we have discussed opportunities to join together. But we have

worked together in an effort to strengthen the Duma to make it a more powerful force in the governing of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, it was 5 years ago that I brought over then General Alexander Lebed, who is today the governor of Krasnoyarsk. I brought him over to testify 5 years ago of what he thought was happening in the Yeltsin government 5 years ago, and he said before this Congress and my committee that the current administration was corrupt. And following General Lebed's testimony, I brought over the leading Russian environmental activist Alexei Yablakov, Dr. Yablakov himself a member of the Academy of Sciences, and at two hearings on the public record he said that the leadership in Russia was corrupt, that it was siphoning off money that should have been going to the Russian people, and he begged America to come in and help establish proper oversight.

Mr. Speaker, that was not last year, it was not last month. Those hearings were 3, 4, 5, and 6 years ago. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have been telling this administration repeatedly that its policies were going in the wrong direction, that reinforcing Boris Yeltsin as a person as opposed to reinforcing institutions of the presidency, of the parliament and of the Constitution in Russia would eventually cause us major problems.

Mr. Speaker, it was 3 years ago that I brought in Stanislav Lunev, the highest ranking defector from the Soviet Russian Intelligence Service, to talk about some of the continuing problems that Russia was going through and how we needed to be aggressive in dealing with Russia, to ask candid questions.

So over the past 5, 6, 7 years, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has repeatedly questioned the policies of this administration relative to our embracing Boris Yeltsin, embracing him under any circumstance, fearful of embarrassing him. And that has been our policy for the last 7 or 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Actually starting with the last year of President Bush and then beginning with the leadership of President Clinton, we have seen a consistent policy of reinforcing one man instead of the institutions that Russia needs to strengthen itself so that it may survive for a long period of time much like America has survived.

So with those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, a year ago I traveled to Moscow because I knew at that time that the Russian Duma was opposed to any more IMF funding going into their country. Now, imagine that, Mr. Speaker. Here, the elected Russian leaders equivalent to our Congress who were about to receive another \$4 billion in outside aid from the International Monetary Fund, and here they were standing up, all seven major factions saying to the world, we do not want anymore IMF funding. We do not want any more dollars coming into our country.

Now, at the same time, the U.S. Congress has been saying the same thing. In fact, for 8 months President Clinton could not get the support in the Congress to support additional IMF funds to replenish the ones that had been committed. Why would the Russian Duma members oppose more IMF funding for their own homeland? The reason is very simple, Mr. Speaker.

Because for the previous 5 and 6 years, Duma Members had seen billions and billions of dollars go into Russia that were designed and supposedly earmarked to help Russian people, and time and time again, they saw those dollars simply flow through the system, through the oligarchs running the banking system in Moscow, many of whom were Yeltsin's friends and back out the other side.

Where were the dollars going? To U.S. bank accounts, to U.S. real estate investments, to Swiss bank accounts, to the Russian people in some cases who were former leaders of the Communist party and the KGB who had offshore accounts. In fact, there are reports being investigated today that Boris Yeltsin himself and his family had secret bank accounts where they have stashed significant amounts of money for his retirement days.

So it was no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that the Russian leaders said, we do not want any more, we do not want any more of your money. With those thoughts in mind, and realizing that if we did not get additional IMF dollars into Russia, their economy would collapse, I traveled to Moscow and I took with me eight points. Because I was convinced that if I could convince the Duma to accept a new direction in dealing with Russia, that perhaps we could bring some discipline and some new direction for the way that Russia was moving.

To my surprise, the Duma deputies that I met with and worked with representing various factions agreed to all eight points. Mr. Speaker, last week I submitted those eight points in the form of legislation. I want to review those eight points tonight because I think they represent a new direction for the U.S. in terms of dealing with Russia.

The Joint Statement of Principles Governing Western and Foreign Assistance to Russia is simple, but I think it is profound. In fact, I have introduced it and it is out now, H.R. 3027, for those Members who would like to become cosponsors. The eight principles lay out a new direction in terms of our relationship with Russia, both monetarily and in terms of dealing with them on issues of transparency.

The first is a simple one, Mr. Speaker, and that is to establish a joint Russian-U.S. legislative oversight commission to monitor all Western resources going into Russia. Today, there is no such effort. Today, we have no capability to monitor inside of Russia where the dollars are going, the dollars from the International Monetary Fund,

the dollars from the World Bank, and the dollars from the U.S. taxpayer.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, we put approximately \$1 billion a year of U.S. taxpayer money into Russia, much of it through the Cooperative Debt Reduction Program, other money through our military-to-military efforts, environmental cooperation, and cooperation with Russia in helping them stabilize their economy. So we, in fact, directly and indirectly put billions of dollars into Russia every year. There is today no ability for the U.S. Congress and the Russian Duma to monitor where those dollars end up.

Now, the administration would have us believe that they can watch over where the money is going, but I would say this, Mr. Speaker. Not being able to trust the Russian regime of Boris Yeltsin, which I think is a uniform given right now, I think everyone understands and it has certainly been pronounced in the press, as just several weeks ago we saw the first indictments handed down in the New York Bank case where there is expected defrauding of up to \$4 billion to \$5 billion of IMF money for the Bank of New York that was assisting some of Yeltsin's friends in Moscow.

We need to have the capability inside of Russia, one that understands the Russian process, but is backed up by the integrity of the U.S. The only way to accomplish that is to get the Russian Parliament, the Duma, and the Federation Council to join with the Congress in establishing a bilateral commission, separate from our two governments, separate from Bill Clinton and separate from Boris Yeltsin, whose only purpose would be to monitor where the monies are going; not to determine where they go, because we do not want congressional interference in saying that money should go to this agency versus that. That is up to the two administrations, whether it would be Clinton or Yeltsin or their successors.

Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a process where our two elected parliaments, representing both political parties in America and representing all of the political factions in Russia, can monitor where the dollars are ending up in Russia. The Russians love that recommendation, because the Duma today has no input in terms of monitoring where the money has gone and where it is going today and where it will go in the future.

The second principle was to focus Western resources on programs like housing that will help to develop a Russian middle class. Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past 7 or 8 years, we have pumped billions of dollars into Russia. Do we see a housing industry developing? Absolutely not. To date, Russia does not even have an established mortgage program. Three years ago, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and I traveled to Moscow. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), as we know, is a very

successful banker from North Carolina, and he envisioned a plan where, initially controlled by a U.S. commission, we would help Russia establish a Western-style mortgage program, with tight discipline, a program that would bypass Russian banks because of their corruptness, that would establish standards based on the U.S. mortgage system with tight controls to which Russian entities could apply. We outlined this in a piece of legislation.

The Russian Duma was so excited, they produced this document, Mr. Speaker. It says, Housing for Our People. That was over 3 years ago, Mr. Speaker. We came back and we told the administration, the Duma, including the Communists in the Duma, we are ready to embrace a Western-style mortgage program initially controlled by the U.S., so that we can maintain the integrity of it when it is first started, and once it becomes successfully operational, then after a period of years, turn it over to the Russians to operate like our Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Mr. Speaker, the Russians even gave it a name. They called it Natasha Mae like our Fannie Mae.

They were excited about this idea, because for the first time, it would create a mortgage program at low interest rates and we envisioned below 10 percent interest rates for terms of 30 years to help develop a housing market to create jobs and housing for Russia's people.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was over 2 years ago that I came back from Moscow on one of our trips, after having negotiated the first phase of this, and I went to the administration very quietly. I went to Ambassador Morningstar with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who at that time was in charge of the Russia desk at the State Department. And I went to him because Russia was very paranoid at that time about our expanding NATO.

Russians were being told by the ultranationalists in Russia that this was America's way of threatening Russia and using NATO to take over Russia. They were scaring the Russian people. And if my colleagues understand the history of Russia as I do, where Russia has been invaded from the west and the north and the south repeatedly in its history, my colleagues will understand why Russians might be paranoid and might believe the outlandish rhetoric from some of the ultranationalists in Russia trying to benefit politically from scaring the Russian people, basically putting in false ideas about America's real intentions.

But the gentleman from North Carolina and I went to Ambassador Morningstar; and we said, Ambassador, you have a chance here, and we want to give you a chance to have President Clinton do something extremely positive to show the Russian people that NATO's expansion is not about backing Russia into a corner. Take this housing mortgage initiative. We as Republicans



will help you get some small seed funding from the Congress. Take that seed money as we have done with Israeli housing and go to our NATO allies, all of them, and ask them to put a per capita amount equal to what we put up and create a NATO housing mortgage fund.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we had taken the initiative 2 years ago, over 2 years ago with a very small amount of money going to our NATO allies and said put up a per capita amount and we will create a NATO housing mortgage fund to show the Russian people that we want them to enjoy the benefits of democracy, we want them to enjoy the benefits of free markets, and a benefit from the kinds of systems we have in the West because as we all know, when housing starts up in America, our economy is strong, because housing starts create jobs.

The administration had no interest in our idea. In fact, Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, the administration's only support for mortgages in Moscow has been to the established banks that we all know in many cases are corrupt, where they are charging interest rates of 15 to 30 percent for terms of 5 to 10 years, which we all know no Russian family could afford to be able to purchase a home. A missed opportunity.

So our second initiative says to those lending institutions putting money into Russia that you must focus the resources on programs like housing that will help to develop a Russian middle class, because the long-term success of Russia is going to require a strong middle class, much like America and much like Europe and much like Japan have. Today, Russia has no middle class.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area where all of us should come together. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we would have taken the \$20 billion of IMF money that has been dumped into Russia, which who knows what it has been used for. I cannot point to one thing in Russia today that has been built with the \$20 billion of IMF money we put in. But imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we had built \$20 billion of homes for Russia's citizens. Even if they went bankrupt or belly up, would they be any worse off than they are today?

□ 2115

They have nothing to show for the billions of dollars of U.S. and World Bank and IMF money that has gone into their country. If we had put the money into mortgages, we would have \$20 billion worth of new housing, and all the jobs that would have gone along with that to show for our investment.

The third priority, Mr. Speaker, in our joint statement is to make western resources available to reform-minded regional governments. Our policy for the past 7 and 8 years has been to reinforce Yeltsin in Moscow. Think of our policy: Clinton/Yeltsin, Major/Chernomyrdin. Everything has gone through those figures. In many cases,

Mr. Speaker, anyone who travels to Russia knows that Moscow is Moscow and the rest of the Russian people consider the rest of Russia to be almost a second nation.

What has been our policy? It has been to reinforce Yeltsin and his cronies in Moscow, and not reinforce those reform-minded regions that are making outstanding progress in privatizing their land; in collecting more taxes; in making responsible actions to control corruption; in putting into place a legal system with a fair court system. We have done nothing of substance over the past 7 years to help direct our assets and our resources toward those regions to allow them to continue their reforms. If anything, they have looked at America and said, well, you in the West and you in America only want to reinforce Yeltsin, and he is corrupt. You are ignoring us out here in the regions where we are doing good things, where the governors in fact are making the reforms that we wanted to have happen in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth principle was to deny any corrupt institutions, especially those in Moscow, any future resources. If a bank, if a lending institution or a business, is found to be corrupt, then what we say is we go after those companies, those individuals, try to bring them to justice, try to recapture any money that is left, sell off any assets we can seize, and never give them any more money again. Again, the Russians were ecstatic. The first four principles, all of them they loved.

Number five, and this one came from George Soros, who has probably been the single biggest private entrepreneurial in Moscow for the past 20, 25 years, I traveled up to New York to meet with him before I went to Moscow a year ago and I said, "Mr. Soros, what would you do after this economic collapse of August a year ago, what would you do to help the Russian economic situation?"

He said, "Congressman, there is only one thing that I could think of that needs to be done." He said, "The International Monetary Fund is out of sync. It does not understand emerging economies like Russia's. What I think you need to do in the Congress is to call for the IMF to empanel an international blue ribbon commission to make recommendations back to the IMF, to reform itself, to make it more responsive to emerging economies like the Russian economy."

So the fifth recommendation is just that, to have the International Monetary Fund establish a blue ribbon task force to make recommendations as to how it can reform itself.

Mr. Speaker, the sixth is probably the most substantive point of all the principles that we laid out, and this is absolutely amazing because this principle was a principle that the IMF has been demanding of Russia for the past 4 years and could not get. This principle is the principle Bill Clinton has been calling for for the past 4 years and

could not get, and that was to put the horse in front of the cart, make the reforms precede and not follow the resources; to have the Russian Government understand reforms must come first and then the dollars will flow.

Now, the IMF said that was necessary, and the Duma said no way are we passing your tough reforms.

Mr. Speaker, if I was in the Duma I would say the same thing. Why should I pass tough reforms simply because the IMF board and Bill Clinton want us to pass them, or Boris Yeltsin, so we can get more IMF money when for the first 7 years that IMF money was coming in you ignored us, you pretended we were not here? In fact, you called us thugs and rogues and thieves and yet now you want us to do what you call the responsible thing?

I do not blame the Duma one bit. I would not come in and bail out a bunch of corrupt thieves that have siphoned off billions of dollars. When the members of the Duma, when the factions in the Duma see that we are willing to put some other principles down on the table, all of a sudden it is a different story because with these principles they see that we want the money to flow in a different direction. We want to recognize the regions. We want to help reward those regions that are doing good things. We want to have legislative oversight of where the money is going. When those things are done and the Duma understands, it must make the tough decisions. It must reform the budget process. It must collect taxes. It must make people pay for their electric and their housing, something that never happened in a Communist regime, and it must begin to privatize the land in Russia.

The seventh principle, Mr. Speaker, was to create a joint U.S.-Russian business-to-business relationship program, where we would identify as many CEOs in America as possible, at the small- and medium-sized corporate level, and we would link them up directly with the corresponding Russian CEO of a small- to medium-sized enterprise so that we could identify for every enterprise and business in Russia an American CEO that would become a mentor so they could work together one-on-one, discuss profits, motivating employees, meeting bottom lines, marketing techniques, the kinds of things that Russian entrepreneurs have to learn to compete in today's market worldwide; establishing a one-on-one program where American business leaders can interact with Russian business leaders one-on-one.

There are some efforts underway along that line but they are primarily at the upper, larger corporate level as opposed to small- and medium-sized manufacture and business establishment.

The last principle, Mr. Speaker, was to say that within 3 years we would bring 15,000 young Russian students to America. These students would be both

graduate and undergraduate students. They would be enrolled in American schools that are offering degrees in business, finance, accounting, and economics. The principles would allow them to get their degree and go back to Russia and create the next generation of free market leaders.

Now there was a stipulation in this principle, Mr. Speaker. None of these students could stay in America and live. When they completed their degrees, they would have to go back to Russia to their communities, to their towns and cities and regions, and live to help Russia create a new generation of free market leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the kind of approach that will allow us to help Russia help itself; not just pumping in billion after billion, uncontrolled as it has been done for the past 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that outlined these principles was dropped in the House last week. As I said, it is H.R. 3027. I was proud when I dropped the bill into the hopper that I had 25 Democrat cosponsors and 25 Republican cosponsors. Mr. Speaker, 50 Members of Congress made a statement last week and now we are up above 50 Members of Congress. I have had a couple more Democrats and more Republicans come on as cosponsors and come up to me and want to get more information, but when we dropped the bill last week, 25 Democrats and 25 Republicans said our policy needs to change. We need to deal with Russia in a new way.

Yes, we need to work with Russia. Yes, we need to help Russia stabilize itself, but not the way we have done it in the past.

I would encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to sign on as cosponsors of H.R. 3027, so that we can set a new course and a new direction in terms of our relationship with Russia and the Russian people, because the Duma, Mr. Speaker, in Russia feels the same way that we do. In fact, we will be taking a delegation probably to Russia sometime before the end of the year. As we all know, Russia is having their Duma elections in December. All of us are watching and hoping that those people who win in Russia will be people who want to continue a strong relationship with the West.

Mr. Speaker, my policy of engaging Russia is one that allows me to consider myself to be a friend of the Russian people and the Russian Duma, but they know very well, Mr. Speaker, in the 19 times that I have been to Russia that I also can be their toughest critic because I am also convinced that part of our problem with Russia is that we have been so enamored again with President Yeltsin as the leader that we have been unwilling to ask the tough questions.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan had it right. Back when he was in office during the midst of the Cold War and the Soviet Union was maintaining its huge empire of Eastern Bloc regions, Ronald Reagan stood up and gave a famous

speech where he called the then Soviet Union an evil empire. People were aghast that the President of the United States would say that.

Mr. Speaker, the 95 percent of the Russian people who were not members of the Communist party and benefiting from that system agree with him. So 95 percent of the people in Russia who were not communists understood Ronald Reagan when he said it was an evil empire because by not being members of the party they were not benefiting from the spoils. They saw that what Ronald Reagan said was true, and that is why today he still is very much revered in Russia.

Russian people are very bright people. They respect honesty. They respect candor, and they respect consistency. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the last 7 years we have given them none of that. We have pretended things are not what they are. We have so been enamored with Boris Yeltsin that any time something happened involving the theft of IMF money, economic turmoil, we pretended it did not happen. When we had intelligence reports that came before us that showed that there was evidence that Chernomyrdin had people supporting him that were corrupt, what did Vice President Gore do? He wrote the word "bull" across the report and sent it back to the intelligence community because he did not want to hear it because it was saying something he did not want to be true even though it was true.

Mr. Speaker, for 7 years when it came to Russia abusing its money going in, we turned our head the other way because we did not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin, but it is not just with the money, Mr. Speaker.

Back in 1997, as I have mentioned on this floor in the past, one of our career Navy intelligence officers, Lieutenant Jack Daley was flying a reconnaissance mission in Seattle, with a Canadian pilot in a helicopter monitoring a Russian trawling ship that we knew was spying on our submarine fleet in Seattle, in Puget Sound. Lieutenant Daley had a sensation in his eye while he was taking photographs of this trawler that they knew was a spy ship because we had boarded the ship in the past and we saw sonar buoys on the ship which are only used to spy on submarines, and we also knew that ship was a spy ship, by the way called the *Kapitan Man*, because there was no cargo being brought into port and no cargo being taken out of port. It was spying on our submarines.

Lieutenant Daley had this sensation in his eye while flying on this helicopter mission and so the Canadian pilot, in this joint exercise, they landed their helicopter, they reported to the base infirmary and the doctor there said, "You are suffering damage caused by a laser. Lieutenant Daley gave them the film from the camera and, sure enough, as they were taking photographs of this Russian trawler they were lasered from the ship.

Mr. Speaker, that is damage by a foreign nation to one of our own, our flesh and blood, an American hero, one of our soldiers in uniform.

What did we do? Well, the record speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, but I can say in cables that have now been declassified, the Department of Defense cabled back to the State Department and got our current ambassador involved, Ambassador Collins, and the current Russian leader in the State Department, Strobe Talbott, and Bob Bell from the Security Council and each of them was consulted about what to do because this American pilot had been lasered by a Russian ship.

Initially, they wanted no American to board that ship. They did not want an international incident created. The Department of Defense said, no, that is one of our people; we are going to go on that ship so the cable that came back said, only search the public areas of the ship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can you really believe that? That we are now going to board a Russian ship that we know is a spy vessel and we are going to look for a laser generator or a laser gun but the boarders that are going to go on the ship are being told only inspect the public portions of the ship?

□ 2130

Do we really think the Russians are that stupid to leave the laser generator out in the open? So obviously we boarded the ship, and we saw nothing.

Lieutenant Daley was taken down to San Antonio for further medical evaluation, and, in fact, it was determined that he had serious laser damage done to his eyes.

The outrage here, Mr. Speaker, is Jack Daley did nothing but do his job as a 16-year career Navy officer doing naval intelligence. He made the mistake of asking for his country to defend him when a foreign ship and its crew lasered him in the eye.

What did our administration do? We did not want to offend Boris Yeltsin. We did not want to make an incident here. So the State Department cabled back and tried to quash this thing.

Jack Daley was passed over for promotion right after that incident and a second time this past July. Even though his career had been an outstanding career with all positive evaluations, twice since that incident, he was bypassed for promotion.

This is what Jack Daley's commanding officer said to him, Mr. Speaker, in Jack Daley's own words. He said, "Jack, you do not know the pressure I am under to get rid of your case. Jack, you do not know the pressure I am under to get rid of your case." A career Navy intelligence officer being told by his superior that they have to get rid of the case because we do not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin.

Do we really think the Russians respect us? They are not stupid, Mr. Speaker. How about arms control violations? I did a floor speech last June a

year ago where I documented, based on a work done by the Congressional Research Service, not by me, and my colleagues know they serve both sides of the aisle, they are nonpartisan, they documented 17 cases, 17 cases since 1991 of arms control violations by Russian entities where technology was sent to Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea, China, and India. We imposed sanctions that are required by arms control treaties zero times, zero times.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Moscow January 1996. The previous December, the Washington Post carried a front page story above the fold, front page, headline: "Russians caught transferring guidance systems to Iraq".

So I am in Moscow in January. I said to Ambassador Pickering who is now the third ranking leader in the State Department, "Mr. Ambassador, what did the Russians say when you asked them about this transfer of these guidance systems, because you know that is a violation of the missile technology control regime." He said, "Congressman WELDON, I have not asked them yet." I said, "Well, why have you not asked them?" He said, "That has got to come from Washington."

So, Mr. Speaker, I came back, and I wrote a three-page letter to President Clinton at the end of January 1996. I said, "What is the story, Mr. President? You saw the Washington Post headlines. If this occurred, it is a violation of an arms control treaty, and that requires us to act." The President wrote me back in March or April that year; I still have the response.

He said, "Dear Congressman WELDON, you are right. If this violation took place, it is serious. If it took place, it would be a violation of the missile technology control regime. But, Congressman WELDON, we have no evidence."

Mr. Speaker, I was not aware at the time, but I am now, in fact I carry a set of these around with me most of the time, the Russians transferred three different times over 100 sets of these devices to Iraq. These devices are used to make Iraq's missiles more accurate.

Mr. Speaker, 17 times Russian entities violated arms control treaties, and we did nothing. Do we really think the Russians are going to respect us? Do we really think when we abandon Jack Daley that they are going to respect us? Do we really think when we ignore billions and billions of fraud with our IMF money that they are going to respect us? I would not respect us, Mr. Speaker. That is the failure of this administration.

Now, why would this be the case? Well as I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, our policy has been wrong-headed. We have been so preoccupied with Boris Yeltsin's success that nothing else mattered. That is a pretty hefty statement that I would make. How can I back that up?

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues, if they have not yet read

the book by Bill Gertz, who is probably the toughest foreign policy and defense investigative writer in this city for the Washington Times, get a copy of this book *Betrayal* or simply turn to the back of the appendix section, because in the back of this, Mr. Speaker, there are two things that the American people and our colleagues need to see.

First of all, on page 219 of this book, a document that was classified top secret, I do not know how Gertz got it because it was top secret, now the American people can read it, my colleagues will get the full chronology of the State Department cables of the Jack Daley case. So my colleagues can see for themselves that what I am saying about Jack Daley and the involvement of our State Department in trying to keep this thing quiet is right there in the State Department's own words, now declassified in a book that we can buy off the shelf at a bookstore.

Further back in this appendix, Mr. Speaker, on page 275, is a two-page document called "confidential". I do not know how Bill Gertz got this either, Mr. Speaker. But this confidential document is interesting. It is a cable summarizing a personal meeting between Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin. Guess what year it was written, Mr. Speaker? 1996, Mr. Speaker, which is the same year that Boris Yeltsin is running for reelection as the President of Russia.

Let me just read one of the paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, of this now publicized cable between our President and the Russian president. "The President", our President Clinton, "indicated that there was not much time, but he wanted to say a few things about the Russian elections. First of all, he wanted to make sure that everything the United States did would have a positive impact, and nothing should have a negative impact. He was encouraged that the Secretary of State was heading to Moscow to meet with Mr. Primakov, and he wanted the April summit to be a positive event. The United States will work to Russia to ensure this so that it would reinforce everything that Yeltsin had done in this regard."

It goes on to say that the President wanted to make sure that America would not let anything surface that will allow Yeltsin's election to go the wrong way.

Do we wonder why we have a problem, Mr. Speaker? We were so enamored with Boris Yeltsin that institutions did not matter. Yeltsin was our support, not Russian democracy, not Russian capitalism. Do we wonder why today, with Yeltsin's popularity at 2 percent, that the Russian people and their parliament have no respect for us?

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Russia, we must work in a proactive way, because Russia still has tens of thousands of warheads on tens of thousands of missiles that are aimed at America's cities. We do not need a destabilized Russia anymore that sells off this tech-

nology to rogue states and rogue terrorist groups.

But it does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we ignore the reality of what Russian individuals and entities are doing. I am not saying that everybody in Russia is corrupt. But when things are going wrong in Russia, we must challenge them. When Russia is not being honest with us, we must challenge Russia. We must let them know that we want transparency, just as Ronald Reagan did. When they do not give us transparency, they must know there is a price to pay.

So along with working in a new direction with Russia, I want to underscore and reinforce to our colleagues that we must also challenge Russia and what is happening there and whether or not there are forces within Russia that are looking to create instability in our relationship with that Nation.

Now, I am convinced that there are many positive leaders in Russia, many of whom are my good friends. I hope that they win their reelections come December of this year.

But I want to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there are some things that trouble me greatly about Russia that we just do not know enough about and that this administration is not asking Yeltsin to explain because they do not want to embarrass him.

Some examples. Ken Alibek, Mr. Speaker, was for years the head of the Russian's biological weapons program. Under the Soviet Union, Ken Alibek lived in Russia. His job was to monitor and to oversee the entire biological weapons program for the Soviet Union.

I have met with Ken Alibek five or six times. This is his book called *Biohazard*. He is convinced that Russia's biological weapons program continues today.

Mr. Speaker, we need leadership that is willing to challenge Russia on these issues. When someone like Ken Alibek comes forward, yes, we must work to help stabilize Russia, but we must tell the Russians that we want to know whether or not what he is saying is true. We are not doing that today, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking the tough questions.

Or how about Stanislav Lunev? Mr. Speaker, I had Stanislav Lunev, as I mentioned earlier, testify before my committee 3 years ago, as the highest ranking GRU defector ever from the Soviet Union. We had to put him behind a screen, and he had to wear a mask over his head because there is a price on his head from certain aspects of the Russian leadership because of what he has told.

Part of what he said in my hearing 3 years ago was that his job when he worked for the intelligence for Russia, the Soviet Union, and his cover was that he was a correspondent for, I think it was, Tass here at the Soviet Embassy, that one of Lunev's jobs was to look for sites where the Soviet Union could preposition military hardware and equipment on American soil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty provocative statement.

What Lunev said several years ago was that the Soviet Union through its intelligence service deliberately, in a very provocative way, put military equipment and hardware on American soil in predetermined locations. In fact, he told us that that was part of his assignment. In fact, Mr. Speaker, later on this week, I will join Mr. Lunev in looking at one of those sites right outside of Washington where he looked, as a career intelligence officer for the Soviet Union, and scoped out for a drop by the Soviet military and intelligence services.

But not much has come about since Lunev made his comments until 1 month ago. One month ago, Mr. Speaker, this book came out. It is called the Mitrokhin Archive. It seems as though, for 30 years, the chief archivist of the KGB in Moscow did not like the KGB and what it was doing. Very quietly, for 30 years, this Russian gentleman, day by day, wrote down and copied every memo that he was putting in the KGB archives in Moscow. He snuck them out of work every day inside of his clothing, took them to his home and buried them under the floorboards of his house.

In 1992, after the Soviet Union collapsed, he emigrated through the Baltic States. His first trip was to a U.S. embassy, and we turned him down when he told us that he had secret documents from the KGB. He then went to the Brits. The Brits took him in, gave he and his family complete asylum where he lives in Britain today under an assumed name.

The British intelligence then had Mitrokhin link up with Christopher Andrew, who is a Cambridge scholar and an outstanding expert, probably the number one expert in the world on the Soviet KGB. For 6 years, Mr. Speaker, Christopher Andrew translated the Mitrokhin archives and files. This book is the first edition of documenting those files.

On October 26, Mr. Speaker, Christopher Andrew and Gordievsky, another high-ranking KGB defector will travel to Washington, and they will testify before my committee. The American people then can see for themselves and hear the kinds of things that were done during the Soviet era that we need to make sure are not happening today in Russia and that we need to have the will and the tenacity to question the Russian leadership about, not worrying about embarrassing Boris Yeltsin, but whether or not the KGB leadership still continues to do the kinds of things that were done under the Soviet era.

□ 2145

Why is this so critical? Because in the document by Christopher Andrew in the Mitrokhin files, as a follow-up to what Lunev said, they actually give the locations in countries around the world where the Soviet Union

prepositioned military equipment. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? There are sites in the U.S. that are identified in the KGB files where the Soviet Union prepositioned military equipment and buried it and booby-trapped each site.

Now, in the book are photographs in the center where one such site was identified in Switzerland. There are the photographs of that site. The Swiss authorities realized it was booby-trapped, which it was. When they dug down, they found exactly where the KGB files had stated was military hardware that the Mitrokhin files said would be there.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is: Where are these devices on American soil? What towns and cities and park lands currently have in place military equipment and hardware prepositioned by the KGB?

This administration, Mr. Speaker, that has known about these files for 6 years should have been asking those questions of Russia's leadership. We are going to ask those questions now, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to find out if, once again, we have been afraid to ask the tough questions because we do not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one overriding thought here in this whole relationship. We want Russia to succeed. We want the Russian people to have a free democracy. We want Russia to have the institutions that we have in America. But you cannot get there when we deny reality, when we pretend things are something they are not. Because the only thing that occurs then is the other side loses respect for you. I am convinced that is the problem with Russia today. They have lost respect for America.

The Congress, with H.R. 3027, and our new vision for Russia, is outlining a new direction based on three simple premises: Strength, consistency, and candor. Help create the institutions of a true democracy, a strong middle class, a strong parliament, and a strong constitution that will survive individual personalities. If we want Russia to succeed, we must follow these steps, Mr. Speaker. This is the only way that America and Russia can work together and thrive in the 21st century.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARTINEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 19 on account of official business.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 19 on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and October 19 until 4:00 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending the birth of his daughter.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NETHERCUTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, October 19.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 548. An act to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historical Site in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 762. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 356. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to Stanislaus County, California.

H.R. 2684. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3036. An act to restore motor carrier safety enforcement authority to the Department of Transportation.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On October 14, 1999:

H.R. 2561. Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1999, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second quarter of 1999 by Committees of the House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first, second, and third quarters of 1999, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to France, Lithuania, Czech Republic and Morocco: March 27–April 6, 1999:											
Hon. Herbert H. Bauman .....	3/27	3/29	France .....		502.00						502.00
	3/29	3/31	Lithuania .....		468.00						468.00
	3/31	4/3	Czech Republic .....		846.00						846.00
	3/4	4/6	Morocco .....		661.00						661.00
Visit to Vietnam, March 28–April 3, 1999:											
Hon. Lane Evans .....	3/28	3/30	Vietnam .....		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare .....							6,402.38				6,402.38
Hon. Loretta Sanchez .....	3/29	4/3	Vietnam .....		1,378.00				18.48		1,396.48
Commercial airfare .....							3,335.59				3,335.59
Mieke Y. Eoyang .....	3/28	4/3	Vietnam .....		1,656.00						1,656.00
Commercial airfare .....							7,451.80		337.01		7,788.81
Visit to Malta, Italy, Egypt, Belgium, Germany, Macedonia and United Kingdom: April 4–12, 1999:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence .....	4/4	4/6	Malta .....		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy .....		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt .....		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium .....		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany .....		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia .....		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom .....		730.00						730.00
Hon. Saxby Chambliss .....	4/4	4/6	Malta .....		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy .....		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt .....		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium .....		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany .....		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia .....		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom .....		730.00						730.00
Hon. Lindsey Graham .....	4/4	4/6	Malta .....		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy .....		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt .....		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium .....		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany .....		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia .....		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom .....		730.00						730.00
Andrew K. Ellis .....	4/4	4/6	Malta .....		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy .....		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt .....		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium .....		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany .....		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia .....		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom .....		730.00						730.00
Maureen P. Cragin .....	4/4	4/6	Malta .....		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy .....		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt .....		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium .....		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany .....		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia .....		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom .....		730.00						730.00
Visit to Austria, April 30–May 2, 1999:											
Hon. Curt Weldon .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Jim Saxton .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Roscoe G. Bartlett .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Jim Gibbons .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Joseph R. Pitts .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Hon. Don Sherwood .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
David J. Trachtenberg .....	4/30	5/2	Austria .....		458.00						458.00
Visit to France, June 11–14, 1999:											
Andrew K. Ellis .....	6/11	6/14	France .....		1,154.65						1,154.65
Committee total .....					19,789.65		17,189.77		355.49		37,334.91

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE, Chairman, July 30, 1999.

#### AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND AUG. 13, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Amy Jensen .....	4/3	4/5	Korea .....		576.00						
	4/5	4/8	Australia .....		354.00						

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND AUG. 13, 1999—Continued

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Ron Lasch .....	4/8	4/11	New Zealand .....		259.00						
	4/3	4/5	Korea .....		576.00						
	4/5	4/8	Australia .....		354.00						
Lisa Boepple .....	4/8	4/11	New Zealand .....		259.00						
	8/7	8/13	Armenia, Azerbaijan .....		800.00						
Committee total .....					3,178.00						3,178.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Sept. 22, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Charles T. Canady .....	4/7	4/9	Italy .....		538.00						538.00
	4/9	4/10	Belgium .....		232.00						232.00
	4/10	4/11	England .....		315.00						315.00
Commercial transportation .....							4,897.50				4,897.50
Hon. William D. Delahunt .....	6/11	6/14	Haiti .....		455.50		( <sup>3</sup> )				455.50
Committee total .....					1,540.50		4,897.50				6,438.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Aug. 6, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Chris Barton, Staff .....	3/28	4/9	Asia .....		2,572.00						2,572.00
Commercial Airfare .....							5,651.30				5,651.30
John Mills, Staff .....	4/5	4/10	Middle East .....		1,665.00						1,665.00
Commercial Airfare .....							5,167.78				5,167.78
Tom Newcomb, Staff .....	4/5	4/10	Middle East .....		1,665.00						1,665.00
Commercial Airfare .....							5,167.78				5,167.78
Catherine Eberwein, Staff .....	4/6	4/9	Asia .....		877.00						877.00
							( <sup>3</sup> )				0.00
Tom Newcomb, Staff .....	5/27	6/1	Europe .....		1,352.00						1,352.00
Commercial Airfare .....							4,746.53				4,746.53
Hon. Gary Condit .....	6/12	6/15	Europe .....		1,419.30						1,419.30
							( <sup>3</sup> )				0.00
Committee totals .....					9,550.30		20,733.39		0.00		30,283.69

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

PORTER J. GROSS, Chairman, July 30, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO ITALY, INDIA, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 29, AND APR. 5, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Richard A. Gephardt .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Robert Borski .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Nancy Pelosi .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Jim McDermott .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Rosa De Lauro .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Dan Miller .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Mark Foley .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Bill Delahunt .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Silvestre Reyes .....	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Mike Thompson .....	3/30	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00



October 18, 1999

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H10171

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO ITALY, INDIA, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 29, AND APR. 5, 1999—  
Continued

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Steve Elmerdorf .....	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
Brett O'Brien .....	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
Kris Keller .....	4/30	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
Paul Berkowitz .....	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
Admiral John Eisold .....	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic .....		295.00						295.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy .....		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India .....		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic .....		590.00						590.00
Committee total .....			Czech Republic .....		30,740.00						30,740.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Aug. 5, 1999.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO SCOTLAND AND GERMANY, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1, AND SEPT. 7, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Speaker Hastert .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Nancy Johnson .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Porter Goss .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Rick Lazio .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Rob Portman .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Jim DeMint .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Scott Palmer .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Bill Inglee .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Ted VanderMeid .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Christy Surprenant .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Pete Jeffries .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Chris Scheve .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Brian Gunderson .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Dan Turton .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Bill Livingood .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Dwight Comedy .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Dr. John Eisold .....	9/1	9/4	Scotland .....	185	294.00						294.00
Dwight Comedy .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Dr. John Eisold .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Speaker Hastert .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Nancy Johnson .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Porter Goss .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Rick Lazio .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Rob Portman .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Jim DeMint .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Scott Palmer .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Bill Inglee .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Ted VanderMeid .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Christy Surprenant .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Pete Jeffries .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Chris Scheve .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Brian Gunderson .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Dan Turton .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Bill Livingood .....	9/4	9/7	Germany .....	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Committee total .....											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Sept. 30, 1999.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO TAIWAN, THAILAND, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 8, AND AUG. 20, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Chaplain James D. Ford .....	8/8	8/10	Taiwan .....		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand .....		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia .....		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand .....		713.19						713.19
Committee total .....					2,819.86						2,819.86

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES D. FORD, Sept. 22, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO SPAIN AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 9, AND AUG. 14, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Theodore J. Van Der Meid <sup>3</sup>	8/9	8/11	Spain		847.00						847.00
	8/11	8/14			990.00						990.00
Commercial airfare							5,101.69				5,101.69
Committee total											6,938.69

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Purpose: Review digitization and electronic distribution activities or various National and Institutional Libraries and archives; and to discuss with Spanish and Italian officials possibilities of sharing such technologies and activities with the U.S. Library of Congress.

THEODORE J. VAN DER MEID, Oct. 8, 1999.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4794. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—School Nutrition Service: Nondiscretionary Technical Amendments (RIN: 0584-AC01) received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4795. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the request and availability of appropriations to enable the Department of Health and Human Services' Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to support the needs of New Jersey in the wake of Hurricane Floyd; (H. Doc. No. 106-144); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4796. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Congressional Medal of Honor [DFARS Case 98-D304] received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4797. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Brand Name or Equal Purchase Descriptions [DFARS Case 99-D023] received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4798. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan: Alaska [AK21-1709; FRL-6450-8] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4799. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4800. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determination [Docket No. FEMA-7296] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4801. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4802. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4803. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Drugs and Biologics; Determination That Informed Consent is NOT Feasible or Is Contrary to the Best Interests of Recipients; Revocation of 1990 Interim Final Rule; Establishment of New Interim Final Rule [Docket No. 90N-0302] (RIN: 0910-A89) received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4804. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of the Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Final Standard Review Plan—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4805. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Audit of Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 1998," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4806. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4807. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3E for the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4808. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prompt Payment (RIN: 0348-AB47) received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4809. A letter from the Director, Retirement and Insurance Service, Office of Insurance Programs, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Program: Court Orders (RIN: 3206-A149) received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4810. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062-9062-01; I.D. 100599B] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4811. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interest On Underpayments And Overpayments of Customs Duties, Taxes, Fees And Interest [T.D. 99-74] (RIN: 1515-AB76) received October 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4812. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flights To And From Cuba [T.D. 99-71] (RIN: 1515-AC51) received October 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4813. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Proc. 99-38] received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4814. A letter from the Health Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report regarding the appropriate health care for Gulf War veterans who suffer from a Gulf War illness; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on October 15, 1999]

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1714. A bill to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce; with an amendment (Rept. 106-341, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2300. A bill to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students; with an amendment (Rept. 106-386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on October 18, 1999]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1753. A bill to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-377 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106-378 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 915. A bill to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges; with an amendment (Rept. 106-387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Rept. 106-388). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1528. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (Rept. 106-389). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2496. A bill to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994; with an amendment (Rept. 106-390). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-391). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2389. A bill to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the countries for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-392 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabilities meaningful opportunities to work, to extend health care coverage for such beneficiaries, and to make additional miscellaneous amendments relating to Social Security; with an amendment (Rept. 106-393 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2. A bill to send more dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-394 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-396). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Ways and Means dis-

charged. H.R. 2 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 18, 1999.

H.R. 2389. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 1999.

H.R. 3070. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 19, 1999.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (for herself, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 3089. A bill to provide for a comprehensive scientific review of the current conservation status of the northern spotted owl as a result of implementation of the President's Northwest Forest Plan, which is a national strategy for the recovery of the species on public forest lands; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3090. A bill to provide the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain lands to the Elim Native Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 3091. A bill to provide for the protection of train employees; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to change the rate of increase in Medicare+Choice capitation rates for 2000 and subsequent years; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prevent the release of hazardous waste due to flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 3094. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to convey to the city of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, certain real property located at the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 3095. A bill to remove the waiver authority for the prohibition on military assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to correct the treatment of tax-exempt financing of professional sports facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3097. A bill to prevent governmental entities from using tax-exempt financing to engage in unfair competition against private enterprise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3098. A bill to authorize grants for certain water and waste disposal facility projects in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

277. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 98 memorializing the United States Congress to take appropriate action to provide that reimbursement of operational expenses of school bus drivers who own their own school buses and are contract employees of a school system will not be taxed as income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 82: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 274: Mr. VITTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 325: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 329: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 371: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 420: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 460: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 568: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 601: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 632: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 664: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 675: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 728: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 740: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 762: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. BARCIA, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 792: Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 798: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 828: Mr. BLILEY and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 837: Mr. HOFFEL.

H.R. 860: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 881: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 890: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 919: Mr. SABO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 925: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 997: Mr. VITTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 1163: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H.R. 1180: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 1271: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SABO.  
 H.R. 1303: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 1304: Mr. UPTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PHELPS.  
 H.R. 1367: Mr. HORN.  
 H.R. 1478: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. WEINER.  
 H.R. 1482: Mr. SABO.  
 H.R. 1525: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 1579: Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. KUYKENDALL.  
 H.R. 1592: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 1625: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 1650: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WU, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 1775: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICA.  
 H.R. 1821: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 1824: Mr. EHRLICH.  
 H.R. 1869: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. DUNN.  
 H.R. 1876: Mr. FROST, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. COBURN.  
 H.R. 1977: Mr. HOLDEN.  
 H.R. 1994: Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 1998: Mr. LINDER.  
 H.R. 2001: Mr. MCINNIS.  
 H.R. 2002: Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 2053: Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 2166: Mr. BASS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. GILCREST.  
 H.R. 2260: Mr. WELLER and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 2289: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 2418: Mr. LINDER, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. JENKINS.  
 H.R. 2451: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2470: Mr. BRYANT.  
 H.R. 2512: Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. REYES.  
 H.R. 2539: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 2573: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 2590: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H.R. 2640: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. RAMSTAD.  
 H.R. 2678: Mr. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 2720: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KLECZKA.  
 H.R. 2731: Mr. WEINER.  
 H.R. 2748: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2813: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2827: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WELLER.  
 H.R. 2828: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 2864: Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 2865: Ms. LEE and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2870: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KING, and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 2882: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 2899: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 2900: Mr. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 2915: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2936: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 2939: Mr. CLAY and Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 2947: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. SALMON.  
 H.R. 2966: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 2980: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 3011: Mr. PICKERING.  
 H.R. 3044: Mr. BONIOR.  
 H.R. 3057: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 3070: Mr. CRANE and Mr. ISAKSON.  
 H.R. 3072: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 3075: Mr. HAYES, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GILCREST, and Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 3082: Mr. CAMP.  
 H.R. 3087: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.J. Res. 46: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.  
 H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. LARSON.  
 H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. RUSH.  
 H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. BERMAN.  
 H. Con. Res. 188: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DINGELL.  
 H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. ARMEY.  
 H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. OSE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H. Res. 169: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H. Res. 325: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. RAHALL.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3081: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: Mr. ARMEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Before section 111 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent sections accordingly):

### SEC. 111. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

Subpart 1 of part A of title I is amended by inserting after section 1115A of the Act the following:

### "SEC. 1115B. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—If a student is eligible to be served under section 1115(b), or attends a school eligible for a schoolwide program under section 1114, and becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends and that receives assistance under this part, then the local educational agency may use funds provided under this part to pay the supplementary costs for such student to attend another school. The agency may use the funds to pay for the supplementary costs of such student to attend any other public or private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, in the same State as the school where the criminal offense occurred, that is selected by the student's parent. The State educational agency shall determine what actions constitute a violent criminal offense for purposes of this section.

"(b) SUPPLEMENTARY COSTS.—The supplementary costs referred to in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

"(1) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that also serves the school where the violent criminal offense occurred, the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student;

"(2) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that does not serve the school where the violent criminal offense occurred but is located in the same State—

"(A) the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student; and

"(B) the reasonable costs of transportation for the student to attend the school selected by the student's parent; and

"(3) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, the costs of tuition, required fees, and the reasonable costs of such transportation.

"(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Federal law shall be construed to prevent a parent assisted under this section from selecting the public or private elementary school or secondary school that a child of the parent will attend within the State.

"(d) CONSIDERATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance used under this section to pay the costs for a student to attend a private school shall not be considered to be Federal aid to the school, and the Federal Government shall have no authority to influence or regulate the operations of a private school as a result of assistance received under this section.

"(e) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—A student assisted under this section shall remain eligible to continue receiving assistance under this section for 5 academic years without regard to whether the student is eligible for assistance under section 1114 or 1115(b).

"(f) STATE LAW.—All actions undertaken under this section shall be undertaken in accordance with State law and may be undertaken only to the extent such actions are permitted under State law.

"(g) TUITION CHARGES.—Assistance under this section may not be used to pay tuition or required fees at a private elementary school or secondary school in an amount that is greater than the tuition and required

fees paid by students not assisted under this section at such school.

"(h) SPECIAL RULE.—Any school receiving assistance provided under this section shall comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

"(i) ASSISTANCE; TAXES AND OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

"(1) ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES, NOT SCHOOLS.—Assistance provided under this section shall be considered to be aid to families, not schools. Use of such assistance at a school shall not be construed to be Federal financial aid or assistance to that school.

"(2) TAXES AND DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—Assistance provided under this section to a student shall not be considered to be income of the student or the parent of such student for Federal, State, or local tax purposes or for determining eligibility for any other Federal program.

"(j) PART B OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the requirements of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.).

"(k) SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by sectarian institutions.

"(l) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount of assistance provided under this part for a student shall not exceed the per pupil expenditure for elementary or secondary education, as appropriate, by the local educational agency that serves the school where the criminal offense occurred for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made."

After part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by section 171 of the bill, insert the following:

#### **PART F—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES**

##### **SEC. 181. ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.**

(a) ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.—Title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### **"PART H—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES**

##### **"SEC. 1801. SHORT TITLE.**

"This part may be cited as the "Academic Emergency Act".

##### **"SEC. 1802. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to States that have 1 or more schools designated under section 1803 as academic emergency schools to provide parents whose children attend such schools with education alternatives.

"(b) GRANTS TO STATES.—Grants awarded to a State under this part shall be awarded for a period of not more than 5 years.

##### **"SEC. 1803. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**

"(a) DESIGNATION.—The Governor of each State may designate 1 or more schools in the State that meet the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (b) or are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b) as academic emergency schools.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be designated as an academic emergency school, the school shall be a public elementary school—

"(1) with a consistent record of poor performance by failing to meet minimum academic standards as determined by the State; and

"(2) in which more than 50 percent of the children attending are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

"(c) LIST TO SECRETARY.—To receive a grant under this part, the Governor shall submit a list of academic emergency schools to the State educational agency and the Secretary.

##### **"SEC. 1804. APPLICATION AND STATE SELECTION.**

"(a) APPLICATION.—Each State in which the Governor has designated 1 or more schools as academic emergency schools shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes the following:

"(1) ASSURANCES.—Assurances that the State shall—

"(A) use the funds provided under this part to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds that would otherwise be available for the purposes of this part;

"(B) provide written notification to the parents of every student eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds under this part, informing the parents of the voluntary nature of the program established under this part, and the availability of qualified schools within their geographic area;

"(C) provide parents and the education community with easily accessible information regarding available education alternatives; and

"(D) not reserve more than 4 percent of the amount made available under this part to pay administrative expenses.

"(2) INFORMATION.—Information regarding each academic emergency school, for the school year in which the application is submitted, regarding the number of children attending such school, including the number of children who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the level of student performance.

"(b) STATE AWARDS.—

"(1) STATE SELECTION.—From the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 1814 in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants to States in accordance with this section.

"(2) PRIORITY.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each State that completes an application in accordance with subsection (a) shall receive a grant of sufficient size to provide education alternatives to not less than 1 academic emergency school.

"(3) AWARD CRITERIA.—In determining the amount of a grant award to a State under this part, the Secretary shall take into consideration the number of schools designated as academic emergencies in the State and the number of eligible students in such schools.

"(4) STATE PLAN.—Each State that applies for funds under this part shall establish a plan—

"(A) to ensure that the greatest number of eligible students who attend academic emergency schools have an opportunity to receive an academic emergency relief funds; and

"(B) to develop a simple procedure to allow parents of participating eligible students to redeem academic emergency relief funds.

##### **"SEC. 1805. SELECTION OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY SCHOOLS AND AWARDS TO PARENTS.**

"(a) SELECTION.—The State shall select academic emergency schools based on—

"(1) the number of eligible students attending an academic emergency school;

"(2) the availability of qualified schools near the academic emergency school; and

"(3) the academic performance of students in the academic emergency school.

"(b) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If the amount of funds made available to a State under this part is insufficient to provide every eligible student in a selected academic emergency school with academic emergency relief funds, the State shall devise a random selec-

tion process to provide eligible students in such school whose family income does not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line the opportunity to participate in education alternatives established pursuant to this part.

"(c) PAYMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—From the funds made available to a State under this part and not reserved under section 1804(a)(1)(D), a State shall pay not more than \$3,500 in academic emergency relief funds to the parents of each participating eligible student.

"(2) PERIOD OF AWARDS.—The academic emergency relief funds awarded to parents of participating eligible students shall be awarded for each school year during the grant period which shall terminate—

"(A) when a participating eligible student is no longer a student in the State; or

"(B) at the end of 5 years, whichever occurs first.

"(3) DURATION.—A State shall continue to receive funds under this part for distribution to parents of participating eligible students throughout the 5-year grant period.

##### **"SEC. 1806. QUALIFIED SCHOOLS.**

"(a) QUALIFICATIONS.—A State that submits an application to the Secretary under section 1804 shall publish the qualifications necessary for a school to participate as a qualified school under this part. At a minimum, each such school shall—

"(1) provide assurances to the State that it will comply with section 1810;

"(2) certify to the State that the amount charged to a parent using academic relief funds for tuition and fees does not exceed the amount for such tuition and fees charged to a parent not using such relief funds whose child attends the qualified school (excluding scholarship students attending such school); and

"(3) report to the State, not later than July 30 of each year in a manner prescribed by the State, information regarding student performance.

"(b) CONFIDENTIALITY.—No personal identifiers may be used in such report described in subsection (a)(3), except that the State may request such personal identifiers solely for the purpose of verifying student performance.

##### **"SEC. 1807. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.**

"(a) USE OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.—A parent who receives academic emergency relief funds from a State under this part may use such funds to pay the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for a program of instruction at a qualified school.

"(b) NOT SCHOOL AID.—Academic emergency relief funds under this part shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to a qualified school.

##### **"SEC. 1808. EVALUATION.**

"(a) ANNUAL EVALUATION.—

"(1) CONTRACT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for the conduct of an ongoing rigorous evaluation of the education alternative program established under this part.

"(2) ANNUAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to annually evaluate the education alternative program established under this part in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in subsection (b).

"(3) TRANSMISSION.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States the findings of each annual evaluation under paragraph (2).

“(b) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish minimum criteria for evaluating the education alternative program established under this part. Such criteria shall provide for—

“(1) a description of the effects of the programs on the level of student participation and parental satisfaction with the education alternatives provided pursuant to this part compared to the educational achievement of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part; and

“(2) a description of the effects of the programs on the educational performance of eligible students who receive academic emergency relief funds compared to the educational performance of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part.

**“SEC. 1809. REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**

“(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—Three years after the date of enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit an interim report to Congress on the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2) for the education alternative program established under this part. The report shall contain a copy of the annual evaluation under section 1808(a)(2) of education alternative program established under this part.

“(b) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to Congress, not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2).

**“SEC. 1810. CIVIL RIGHTS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A qualified school under this part shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in carrying out the provisions of this part.

“(b) APPLICABILITY AND CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX.—

“(1) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, subsection (a) shall not apply to a qualified school that is controlled by a religious organization if the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the religious tenets of the qualified school.

“(2) SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prevent a parent from choosing, or a qualified school from offering, a single-sex school, class, or activity.

**“SEC. 1811. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent a qualified school that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to a religious organization from employing, admitting, or giving preference to persons of the same religion to the extent determined by such school to promote the religious purpose for which the qualified school is established or maintained.

“(b) SECTARIAN PURPOSES.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit the use of funds made available under this part for sectarian educational purposes, or to require a qualified school to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols.

**“SEC. 1812. CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.**

“Nothing in this part shall affect the rights of students, or the obligations of public schools of a State, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

**“SEC. 1813. DEFINITIONS.**

“As used in this part:

“(1) The terms “local educational agency” and “State educational agency” have the same meanings given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

“(2) The term “eligible student” means a student enrolled, in a grade between kindergarten and 4th, in an academic emergency school during the school year in which the Governor designates the school as an academic emergency school, except that the parents of a child enrolled in kindergarten at the time of the Governor’s designation shall not be eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds until the child is in first grade.

“(3) The term “Governor” means the chief executive officer of the State.

“(4) The term “parent” includes a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis.

“(5) The term “poverty line” means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

“(6) The term “qualified school” means a public, private, or independent elementary school that meets the requirements of section 1806 and any other qualifications established by the State to accept academic emergency relief funds from the parents of participating eligible students.

“(7) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

“(8) The term “State” means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

**“SEC. 1814. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2004, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated may not exceed \$100,000,000 for any fiscal year.”

(b) REPEALS.—The following programs are repealed:

(1) NATIVE HAWAIIANS.—Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

(2) FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION.—Part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.).

(3) 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS.—Part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8241 et seq.).

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. ARMEY

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Before section 111 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent sections accordingly):

**SEC. 111. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.**

Subpart 1 of part A of title I is amended by inserting after section 1115A of the Act the following:

**“SEC. 1115B. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If a student is eligible to be served under section 1115(b), or attends a school eligible for a schoolwide program under section 1114, and becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends and that receives assistance under this part, then the local educational agency may use funds provided under this part to pay the supplementary costs for such student to attend another school. The agency may use the funds to pay for the supplementary costs of such student to attend any other public or private

elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, in the same State as the school where the criminal offense occurred, that is selected by the student’s parent. The State educational agency shall determine what actions constitute a violent criminal offense for purposes of this section.

“(b) SUPPLEMENTARY COSTS.—The supplementary costs referred to in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

“(1) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that also serves the school where the violent criminal offense occurred, the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student;

“(2) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that does not serve the school where the violent criminal offense occurred but is located in the same State—

“(A) the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student; and

“(B) the reasonable costs of transportation for the student to attend the school selected by the student’s parent; and

“(3) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, the costs of tuition, required fees, and the reasonable costs of such transportation.

“(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Federal law shall be construed to prevent a parent assisted under this section from selecting the public or private elementary school or secondary school that a child of the parent will attend within the State.

“(d) CONSIDERATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance used under this section to pay the costs for a student to attend a private school shall not be considered to be Federal aid to the school, and the Federal Government shall have no authority to influence or regulate the operations of a private school as a result of assistance received under this section.

“(e) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—A student assisted under this section shall remain eligible to continue receiving assistance under this section for 5 academic years without regard to whether the student is eligible for assistance under section 1114 or 1115(b).

“(f) STATE LAW.—All actions undertaken under this section shall be undertaken in accordance with State law and may be undertaken only to the extent such actions are permitted under State law.

“(g) TUITION CHARGES.—Assistance under this section may not be used to pay tuition or required fees at a private elementary school or secondary school in an amount that is greater than the tuition and required fees paid by students not assisted under this section at such school.

“(h) SPECIAL RULE.—Any school receiving assistance provided under this section shall comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

“(i) ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES.—Assistance provided under this section shall be considered to be aid to families, not schools. Use of such assistance at a school shall not be construed to be Federal financial aid or assistance to that school.

“(j) PART B OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.—Nothing in this

section shall be construed to affect the requirements of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.).

“(k) **SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by sectarian institutions.

“(l) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount of assistance provided under this part for a student shall not exceed the per pupil expenditure for elementary or secondary education, as appropriate, by the local educational agency that serves the school where the criminal offense occurred for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.”.

After part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by section 171 of the bill, insert the following:

#### **PART F—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES**

##### **SEC. 181. ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.**

(a) **ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.**—Title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### **“PART H—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES**

##### **“SEC. 1801. SHORT TITLE.**

“This part may be cited as the “Academic Emergency Act”.

##### **“SEC. 1802. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to States that have 1 or more schools designated under section 1803 as academic emergency schools to provide parents whose children attend such schools with education alternatives.

“(b) **GRANTS TO STATES.**—Grants awarded to a State under this part shall be awarded for a period of not more than 5 years.

##### **“SEC. 1803. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**

“(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The Governor of each State may designate 1 or more schools in the State that meet the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (b) or are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b) as academic emergency schools.

“(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be designated as an academic emergency school, the school shall be a public elementary school—

“(1) with a consistent record of poor performance by failing to meet minimum academic standards as determined by the State; and

“(2) in which more than 50 percent of the children attending are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

“(c) **LIST TO SECRETARY.**—To receive a grant under this part, the Governor shall submit a list of academic emergency schools to the State educational agency and the Secretary.

##### **“SEC. 1804. APPLICATION AND STATE SELECTION.**

“(a) **APPLICATION.**—Each State in which the Governor has designated 1 or more schools as academic emergency schools shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes the following:

“(1) **ASSURANCES.**—Assurances that the State shall—

“(A) use the funds provided under this part to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds that would otherwise be available for the purposes of this part;

“(B) provide written notification to the parents of every student eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds under this part, informing the parents of the voluntary nature of the program established under this part, and the availability of qualified schools within their geographic area;

“(C) provide parents and the education community with easily accessible informa-

tion regarding available education alternatives; and

“(D) not reserve more than 4 percent of the amount made available under this part to pay administrative expenses.

“(2) **INFORMATION.**—Information regarding each academic emergency school, for the school year in which the application is submitted, regarding the number of children attending such school, including the number of children who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the level of student performance.

“(b) **STATE AWARDS.**—

“(1) **STATE SELECTION.**—From the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 1814 in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants to States in accordance with this section.

“(2) **PRIORITY.**—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each State that completes an application in accordance with subsection (a) shall receive a grant of sufficient size to provide education alternatives to not less than 1 academic emergency school.

“(3) **AWARD CRITERIA.**—In determining the amount of a grant award to a State under this part, the Secretary shall take into consideration the number of schools designated as academic emergencies in the State and the number of eligible students in such schools.

“(4) **STATE PLAN.**—Each State that applies for funds under this part shall establish a plan—

“(A) to ensure that the greatest number of eligible students who attend academic emergency schools have an opportunity to receive an academic emergency relief funds; and

“(B) to develop a simple procedure to allow parents of participating eligible students to redeem academic emergency relief funds.

##### **“SEC. 1805. SELECTION OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY SCHOOLS AND AWARDS TO PARENTS.**

“(a) **SELECTION.**—The State shall select academic emergency schools based on—

“(1) the number of eligible students attending an academic emergency school;

“(2) the availability of qualified schools near the academic emergency school; and

“(3) the academic performance of students in the academic emergency school.

“(b) **INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.**—If the amount of funds made available to a State under this part is insufficient to provide every eligible student in a selected academic emergency school with academic emergency relief funds, the State shall devise a random selection process to provide eligible students in such school whose family income does not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line the opportunity to participate in education alternatives established pursuant to this part.

“(c) **PAYMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From the funds made available to a State under this part and not reserved under section 1804(a)(1)(D), a State shall pay not more than \$3,500 in academic emergency relief funds to the parents of each participating eligible student.

“(2) **PERIOD OF AWARDS.**—The academic emergency relief funds awarded to parents of participating eligible students shall be awarded for each school year during the grant period which shall terminate—

“(A) when a participating eligible student is no longer a student in the State; or

“(B) at the end of 5 years, whichever occurs first.

“(3) **DURATION.**—A State shall continue to receive funds under this part for distribution to parents of participating eligible students throughout the 5-year grant period.

##### **“SEC. 1806. QUALIFIED SCHOOLS.**

“(a) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—A State that submits an application to the Secretary under section 1804 shall publish the qualifications necessary for a school to participate as a qualified school under this part. At a minimum, each such school shall—

“(1) provide assurances to the State that it will comply with section 1810;

“(2) certify to the State that the amount charged to a parent using academic relief funds for tuition and fees does not exceed the amount for such tuition and fees charged to a parent not using such relief funds whose child attends the qualified school (excluding scholarship students attending such school); and

“(3) report to the State, not later than July 30 of each year in a manner prescribed by the State, information regarding student performance.

“(b) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—No personal identifiers may be used in such report described in subsection (a)(3), except that the State may request such personal identifiers solely for the purpose of verifying student performance.

##### **“SEC. 1807. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.**

“(a) **USE OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.**—A parent who receives academic emergency relief funds from a State under this part may use such funds to pay the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for a program of instruction at a qualified school.

“(b) **NOT SCHOOL AID.**—Academic emergency relief funds under this part shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to a qualified school.

##### **“SEC. 1808. EVALUATION.**

“(a) **ANNUAL EVALUATION.**—

“(1) **CONTRACT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for the conduct of an ongoing rigorous evaluation of the education alternative program established under this part.

“(2) **ANNUAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.**—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to annually evaluate the education alternative program established under this part in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in subsection (b).

“(3) **TRANSMISSION.**—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States the findings of each annual evaluation under paragraph (2).

“(b) **EVALUATION CRITERIA.**—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish minimum criteria for evaluating the education alternative program established under this part. Such criteria shall provide for—

“(1) a description of the effects of the programs on the level of student participation and parental satisfaction with the education alternatives provided pursuant to this part compared to the educational achievement of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part; and

“(2) a description of the effects of the programs on the educational performance of eligible students who receive academic emergency relief funds compared to the educational performance of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part.

##### **“SEC. 1809. REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**

“(a) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—Three years after the date of enactment of the Student Results



Act of 1999, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit an interim report to Congress on the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2) for the education alternative program established under this part. The report shall contain a copy of the annual evaluation under section 1808(a)(2) of education alternative program established under this part.

“(b) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to Congress, not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2).

#### “SEC. 1810. CIVIL RIGHTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A qualified school under this part shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in carrying out the provisions of this part.

“(b) APPLICABILITY AND CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX.—

“(1) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, subsection (a) shall not apply to a qualified school that is controlled by a religious organization if the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the religious tenets of the qualified school.

“(2) SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prevent a parent from choosing, or a qualified school from offering, a single-sex school, class, or activity.

#### “SEC. 1811. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent a qualified school that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to a religious organization from employing, admitting, or giving preference to persons of the same religion to the extent determined by such school to promote the religious purpose for which the qualified school is established or maintained.

“(b) SECTARIAN PURPOSES.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit the use of funds made available under this part for sectarian educational purposes, or to require a qualified school to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols.

#### “SEC. 1812. CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

“Nothing in this part shall affect the rights of students, or the obligations of public schools of a State, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

#### “SEC. 1813. DEFINITIONS.

“As used in this part:

“(1) The terms “local educational agency” and “State educational agency” have the same meanings given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

“(2) The term “eligible student” means a student enrolled, in a grade between kindergarten and 4th, in an academic emergency school during the school year in which the Governor designates the school as an academic emergency school, except that the parents of a child enrolled in kindergarten at the time of the Governor's designation shall not be eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds until the child is in first grade.

“(3) The term “Governor” means the chief executive officer of the State.

“(4) The term “parent” includes a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis.

“(5) The term “poverty line” means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block

Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

“(6) The term “qualified school” means a public, private, or independent elementary school that meets the requirements of section 1806 and any other qualifications established by the State to accept academic emergency relief funds from the parents of participating eligible students.

“(7) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

“(8) The term “State” means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

#### “SEC. 1814. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2004, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated may not exceed \$100,000,000 for any fiscal year.”.

(b) REPEALS.—The following programs are repealed:

(1) NATIVE HAWAIIANS.—Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

(2) FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION.—Part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.).

(3) 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS.—Part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8241 et seq.).

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. MALONEY OF CONNECTICUT  
AMENDMENT NO. 3: Add at the end of the bill the following new title:

#### TITLE IX—ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT

#### SEC. 901. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT.

Title X of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “PART I—ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT

##### “SEC. 10994. SHORT TITLE.

“This part may be cited as the ‘Academic Achievement Enhancement Act’.

##### “SEC. 10995. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) BONUS AWARDS.—The Secretary of Education is authorized to provide bonus awards described in subsection (b) to each eligible local educational agency that has adopted or adopts a policy to end social promotion.

“(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive bonus funds under this section, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary that provides assurances that the agency has adopted a policy to end social promotion. Such policy shall include the following criteria:

“(A) Standards that clearly define and specify the content that a student must master in order to be promoted to the next grade level.

“(B) A system in place that clearly measures or assesses a student's progress in meeting standards.

“(C) A promotion policy that is based on demonstrated achievement in meeting the standards.

“(D) A system in place that monitors student achievement and can identify, in a timely fashion, a student who is struggling to meet the standards.

“(E) An effective intervention program and support services for a student who is identified as being at risk of failing.

“(b) BONUS AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in paragraph (3), a local educational agency that meets the re-

quirements of subsection (a) shall receive a bonus award in an amount that equals 5 percent of the amount the agency received under section 1124 for the preceding fiscal year.

“(2) RATABLY REDUCTION.—

“(A) REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—If the sums made available under this part for any fiscal year are insufficient to pay the full amounts that all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under paragraph (1) or paragraph (3) for such year, the Secretary shall ratably reduce the allotment to such agencies for such year.

“(B) INCREASE IN FUNDS.—If additional funds become available for making payments under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year, allotments that were reduced under subparagraph (A) shall be increased on the same basis as such allotments were reduced.

“(3) MINIMUM AWARD.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), each local educational agency that meets the requirements of subsection (a) shall receive an amount that is not less than \$25,000.

#### “SEC. 10996. USES OF BONUS FUNDS.

“A local educational agency that receives a bonus award under this part shall use such award to supplement the intervention and support programs for students identified as being at risk for failing which may include—

“(1) double-dose instruction;

“(2) weekend classes;

“(3) summer school classes;

“(4) extended day programs; and

“(5) tutoring.

#### “SEC. 10997. REPORTS.

“Each local educational agency that receives a bonus award under this part shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the effectiveness of programs established or enhanced as a result of a bonus award received under this part.

#### “SEC. 10998. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this part, the term ‘double-dose instruction’ means a class in a core subject that meets more frequently than the regularly scheduled class for such subject.”.

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MRS. MINK OF HAWAII  
AMENDMENT NO. 4: In section 1114(c)(1)(B)(ii)(II) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 108 of the bill, insert “, including girls and women” after “underserved populations”.

In section 1114(c)(1)(B)(iii)(I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 108 of the bill, insert “, which may include incorporation of gender-equitable methods and practices” after “schoolwide program”.

In section 1119A(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 116 of the bill—

(1) at the end of subparagraph (I), strike “and”;

(2) at the end of subparagraph (J), strike the period and insert “; and”; and

(3) after subparagraph (J), insert the following:

“(K) include strategies for identifying and eliminating gender and racial bias in instructional materials, methods, and practices.”.

After subparagraph (E) of section 1119A(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 116 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

“(F) instruction in the ways that teachers, principals, and guidance counselors can work with parents and students from groups, such as females and minorities which are under represented in careers in mathematics,

science, engineering, and technology, to encourage and maintain the interest of such students in these careers.”

In section 1119A(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 116 of the bill—

(1) at the end of subparagraph (H) (as redesignated), strike “and”;

(2) at the end of subparagraph (I) (as redesignated), strike the period and insert “; and”;

(3) after subparagraph (I), insert the following:

“(J) instruction in gender-equitable methods, techniques, and practices.”

Strike the matter proposed to be inserted in section 1401(a)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (as proposed by section 142 of the bill).

After the matter proposed to be inserted in section 1401(a)(6) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (as proposed by section 142 of the bill), add the following:

“(7) Pregnant and parenting teenagers are a high at-risk group for dropping out of school and should be targeted by dropout prevention programs.”

In section 1423(6) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 149 of the bill—

(1) after “social” insert “, health”;

(2) after “facilities” insert “, students at risk of dropping out of school,”; and

(3) before the semicolon, insert “, including prenatal health care and nutrition services related to the health of the parent and child, parenting and child development classes, child care, targeted re-entry and outreach programs, referrals to community resources, and scheduling flexibility”.

In section 1424(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 150 of the bill, before the semicolon, insert the following: “, including pregnant and parenting teenagers”.

In section 1424(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 150 of the bill—

(1) after “social” insert “, health,”; and

(2) after “services” insert “, including day care.”

Strike section 152 of the bill and the amendment proposed to be made to section 1426(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

At the end of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 201 of the bill, insert the following:

#### **“PART C—WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY**

##### **“SEC. 5301. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.**

“(a) SHORT TITLE.—This part may be cited as the ‘Women’s Educational Equity Act of 1994’.

“(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

“(1) since the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, women and girls have made strides in educational achievement and in their ability to avail themselves of educational opportunities;

“(2) because of funding provided under the Women’s Educational Equity Act, more curricula, training, and other educational materials concerning educational equity for women and girls are available for national dissemination;

“(3) teaching and learning practices in the United States are frequently inequitable as such practices relate to women and girls, for example—

“(A) sexual harassment, particularly that experienced by girls, undermines the ability of schools to provide a safe and equitable learning or workplace environment;

“(B) classroom textbooks and other educational materials do not sufficiently reflect

the experiences, achievements, or concerns of women and, in most cases, are not written by women or persons of color;

“(C) girls do not take as many mathematics and science courses as boys, girls lose confidence in their mathematics and science ability as girls move through adolescence, and there are few women role models in the sciences; and

“(D) the low number of girls taking higher level computer science courses leading to technical careers, and the low degree of participation of women in the development of education technology, will perpetuate a cycle of disadvantage for girls in elementary schools and secondary schools as technology is increasingly integrated into the classroom; and”

“(E) pregnant and parenting teenagers are at high risk for dropping out of school and existing dropout prevention programs do not adequately address the needs of such teenagers;

“(4) efforts to improve the quality of public education also must include efforts to ensure equal access to quality education programs for all women and girls;

“(5) Federal support should address not only research and development of innovative model curricula and teaching and learning strategies to promote gender equity, but should also assist schools and local communities implement gender equitable practices;

“(6) Federal assistance for gender equity must be tied to systemic reform, involve collaborative efforts to implement effective gender practices at the local level, and encourage parental participation; and

“(7) excellence in education, high educational achievements and standards, and the full participation of women and girls in American society, cannot be achieved without educational equity for women and girls.

##### **“SEC. 5302. STATEMENT OF PURPOSES.**

“It is the purpose of this part—

“(1) to promote gender equity in education in the United States;

“(2) to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet the requirements of title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972; and

“(3) to promote equity in education for women and girls who suffer from multiple forms of discrimination based on sex, race, ethnic origin, limited-English proficiency, disability, or age.

##### **“SEC. 5303. PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized—

“(1) to promote, coordinate, and evaluate gender equity policies, programs, activities and initiatives in all Federal education programs and offices;

“(2) to develop, maintain, and disseminate materials, resources, analyses, and research relating to education equity for women and girls;

“(3) to provide information and technical assistance to assure the effective implementation of gender equity programs;

“(4) to coordinate gender equity programs and activities with other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over education and related programs;

“(5) to assist the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in identifying research priorities related to education equity for women and girls; and

“(6) to perform any other activities consistent with achieving the purposes of this part.

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, or

organizations, institutions, student groups, community groups, and individuals, for a period not to exceed four years, to—

(A) provide grants to develop model equity programs;

“(B) provide funds for the implementation of equity programs in schools throughout the Nation; and

“(C) provide grants to local educational agencies in communities with an historic tie to a major leader in the women’s suffrage movement to educate its students about the significance of the community’s significant former resident.

“(2) SUPPORT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—To achieve the purposes of this part, the Secretary is authorized to provide support and technical assistance—

“(A) to implement effective gender-equity policies and programs at all educational levels, including—

“(i) assisting educational agencies and institutions to implement policies and practices to comply with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;

“(ii) training for teachers, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel, especially preschool and elementary school personnel, in gender equitable teaching and learning practices;

“(iii) leadership training for women and girls to develop professional and marketable skills to compete in the global marketplace, improve self-esteem, and benefit from exposure to positive role models;

“(iv) school-to-work transition programs, guidance and counseling activities, and other programs to increase opportunities for women and girls to enter a technologically demanding workplace and, in particular, to enter highly skilled, high paying careers in which women and girls have been underrepresented;

“(v) enhancing educational and career opportunities for those women and girls who suffer multiple forms of discrimination, based on sex and on race, ethnic origin, limited-English proficiency, disability, socioeconomic status, or age;

“(vi) assisting pregnant students and students rearing children to remain in or to return to secondary school, graduate, and prepare their preschool children to start school;

“(vii) evaluating exemplary model programs to assess the ability of such programs to advance educational equity for women and girls;

“(viii) introduction into the classroom of textbooks, curricula, and other materials designed to achieve equity for women and girls;

“(ix) programs and policies to address sexual harassment and violence against women and girls and to ensure that educational institutions are free from threats to the safety of students and personnel;

“(x) nondiscriminatory tests of aptitude and achievement and of alternative assessments that eliminate biased assessment instruments from use;

“(xi) programs to increase educational opportunities, including higher education, vocational training, and other educational programs for low-income women, including underemployed and unemployed women, and women receiving assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act;

“(xii) programs to improve representation of women in educational administration at all levels; and

“(xiii) planning, development and initial implementation of—

“(I) comprehensive institution- or district-wide evaluation to assess the presence or absence of gender equity in educational settings;

“(II) comprehensive plans for implementation of equity programs in State and local

educational agencies and institutions of higher education; including community colleges; and

“(III) innovative approaches to school-community partnerships for educational equity;

“(B) for research and development, which shall be coordinated with each of the research institutes of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to avoid duplication of research efforts, designed to advance gender equity nationwide and to help make policies and practices in educational agencies and institutions, and local communities, gender equitable, including—

“(i) research and development of innovative strategies and model training programs for teachers and other education personnel;

“(ii) the development of high quality and challenging assessment instruments that are nondiscriminatory;

“(iii) the development and evaluation of model curricula, textbooks, software, and other educational materials to ensure the absence of gender stereotyping and bias;

“(iv) the development of instruments and procedures that employ new and innovative strategies to assess whether diverse educational settings are gender equitable;

“(v) the development of instruments and strategies for evaluation, dissemination, and replication of promising or exemplary programs designed to assist local educational agencies in integrating gender equity in their educational policies and practices;

“(vi) updating high quality educational materials previously developed through awards made under this part;

“(vii) the development of policies and programs to address and prevent sexual harassment and violence to ensure that educational institutions are free from threats to safety of students and personnel;

“(viii) the development and improvement of programs and activities to increase opportunity for women, including continuing educational activities, vocational education, and programs for low-income women, including underemployed and unemployed women, and women receiving assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act; and

“(ix) the development of guidance and counseling activities, including career education programs, designed to ensure gender equity.

#### **“SEC. 5204. APPLICATIONS.**

“An application under this part shall—

“(1) set forth policies and procedures that will ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the activities assisted under this part, including an evaluation of the practices, policies, and materials used by the applicant and an evaluation or estimate of the continued significance of the work of the project following completion of the award period;

“(2) where appropriate, demonstrate how funds received under this part will be used to promote the attainment of one or more of the National Education Goals;

“(3) demonstrate how the applicant will address perceptions of gender roles based on cultural differences or stereotypes;

“(4) where appropriate, describe how funds under this part will be used in a manner that

is consistent with programs under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994;

“(5) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), demonstrate how the applicant will foster partnerships and, where applicable, share resources with State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations (including organizations serving women), parent, teacher, and student groups, businesses or other recipients of Federal educational funding which may include State literacy resource centers;

“(6) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), demonstrate how parental involvement in the project will be encouraged; and

“(7) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), describe plans for continuation of the activities assisted under this part with local support following completion of the grant period and termination of Federal support under this part.

#### **“SEC. 5305. CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES.**

“(a) CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish separate criteria and priorities for awards under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5303(b) to ensure that funds under this part are used for programs that most effectively will achieve the purposes of this part.

“(2) CRITERIA.—The criteria described in subsection (a) may include the extent to which the activities assisted under this part—

“(A) address the needs of women and girls of color and women and girls with disabilities;

“(B) meet locally defined and documented educational equity needs and priorities, including compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;

“(C) are a significant component of a comprehensive plan for educational equity and compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in the particular school district, institution of higher education, vocational-technical institution, or other educational agency or institution; and

“(D) implement an institutional change strategy with long-term impact that will continue as a central activity of the applicant after the grant under this part has terminated.

“(b) PRIORITIES.—In approving applications under this part, the Secretary may give special consideration to applications—

“(1) submitted by applicants that have not received assistance under this part or under part C of title IX of this Act (as such part was in effect on October 1, 1988);

“(2) for projects that will contribute significantly to directly improving teaching and learning practices in the local community; and

“(3) for projects that will—

“(A) provide for a comprehensive approach to enhancing gender equity in educational institutions and agencies;

“(B) draw on a variety of resources, including the resources of local educational agencies, community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, and private organizations;

“(C) implement a strategy with long-term impact that will continue as a central activity of the applicant after the grant under this part has terminated;

“(D) address issues of national significance that can be duplicated; and

“(E) address the educational needs of women and girls who suffer multiple or compound discrimination based on sex and on race, ethnic origin, disability, or age.

“(c) SPECIAL RULE.—To the extent feasible, the Secretary shall ensure that grants awarded under this part for each fiscal year address—

“(1) all levels of education, including preschool, elementary and secondary education, higher education, vocational education, and adult education;

“(2) all regions of the United States; and

“(3) urban, rural, and suburban educational institutions.

“(d) COORDINATION.—Research activities supported under this part—

“(1) shall be carried out in consultation with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to ensure that such activities are coordinated with and enhance the research and development activities supported by the Office; and

“(2) may include collaborative research activities which are jointly funded and carried out with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

“(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this part shall be construed as prohibiting men and boys from participating in any programs or activities assisted with funds under this part.

#### **“SEC. 5306. REPORT.**

“The Secretary, not later than January 1, 2004, shall submit to the President and Congress a report on the status of educational equity for girls and women in the Nation.

#### **“SEC. 5307. ADMINISTRATION.**

“(a) EVALUATION; DISSEMINATION; REPORT.—The Secretary—

“(1) shall evaluate, in accordance with section 14701, materials and programs developed under this part;

“(2) shall disseminate materials and programs developed under this part; and

“(3) shall report to Congress regarding such evaluation, materials, and programs not later than January 1, 2003.

“(b) PROGRAM OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the activities assisted under this part are administered within the Department by a person who has recognized professional qualifications and experience in the field of gender equity education.

#### **“SEC. 5308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, of which not less than  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be available to carry out the activities described in section 5303(b)(1).”